DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 702 FL 026 630

AUTHOR	Davis, Kathryn A., Ed.
TITLE	Foreign Language Teaching & Language Minority Education. Technical Report #19.
INSTITUTION	Hawaii Univ., Manoa. Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
ISBN	ISBN-0-8248-2239-0
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	140p.
CONTRACT	P229A60007
AVAILABLE FROM	University of Hawaii Press, Order Department, 2840 Kolowalu Street, Honolulu, HI 96822-1888 ($20). Tel: 800-650-7811 (Toll Free); Web site: http://www.lll.hawaii.edu/nflrc/.
PUB TYPE	Books (010) -- Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Bilingual Education Programs; *Bilingualism; Elementary Secondary Education; *Heritage Education; Immigrants; Language Minorities; Language Planning; Language Research; Limited English Speaking; *Partnerships in Education; Politics of Education; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning
IDENTIFIERS	United States

ABSTRACT

This volume seeks to examine the potential for building relationships among foreign language, bilingual, and English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) programs with the goal of fostering bilingualism. Part one of the volume examines the sociopolitical contexts for language partnerships, includes the following articles: "Language Planning and Policy in the US" (Rebecca Jasso-Aguilar); "Rethinking Foreign Language Education" (Lourdes Ortega); "Acculturation, Identity, and Language (Zafar Syed and Audrey C. Burnett); and "Learning with Others" (Syed). The topics discussed cover current obstacles to developing bilingualism; implications for acculturation, identity, and language issues for linguistic minorities; and the potential for developing partnerships across the primary, secondary, and tertiary institutions. Part two provides research findings on the Foreign Language Partnership Project, which was designed to capitalize on the resources of immigrant students to enhance foreign language learning. Individual sections include: "The Foreign Language Partnership Project" (Ann Shonle and Megan Thompson Rolland); "Emerging Identities and Heritage Language Education" (Burnett and Syed); "Conclusions: The Benefits and Promise of Language Partnerships" (Shonie and Syed); and a final section, "About the Contributors and How to Contact Them." Numerous references are found at the end of each chapter. (KFT)

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING & LANGUAGE MINORITY EDUCATION

KATHRYN A. DAVIS

SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING & CURRICULUM CENTER
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING & LANGUAGE MINORITY EDUCATION

TECHNICAL REPORT #19

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING & LANGUAGE MINORITY EDUCATION

edited by

KATHRYN A. DAVIS

SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING & CURRICULUM CENTER
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

The contents of this Technical Report were developed under a grant from the Department of Education (CFDA 84.229, P229A60007). However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and one should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

ISBN 0-8248-2239-0

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences–Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials.

ANSI Z39.48-1984

Book design by Deborah Masterson

Distributed by
University of Hawai'i Press
Order Department
2840 Kolowalu Street
Honolulu, HI 96822

ABOUT THE NATIONAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTER

THE SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING AND CURRICULUM CENTER of the University of Hawai'i is a unit of the College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature. Under a grant from the US Department of Education, the Center has since 1990 served as a National Foreign Language Resource Center (NFLRC). The general direction of the Resource Center is set by a national advisory board. The Center conducts research, develops materials, and trains language professionals with the goal of improving foreign language instruction in the United States. The Center publishes research reports and teaching materials; it also sponsors a summer intensive teacher training institute. For additional information about Center programs, write:

Dr. Richard Schmidt, Director
National Foreign Language Resource Center
1859 East-West Road #106
University of Hawai'i
Honolulu, HI 96822

or visit our Web site: http://www.lll.hawaii.edu/nflrc/

NFLRC ADVISORY BOARD

CONTENTS

Kathryn A. Davis
University of Hawai'i

PREFACE

INTRODUCTION

In the United States, second language education has traditionally consisted of three independent professions: foreign language education, English as a second language (ESL), and bilingual education.[1] The independent development of these three fields in the US is due to a number of socio-historical factors, including: (1) the traditionally elite status of foreign language study, (2) the impact of second language acquisition (SLA) research on the emerging ESL profession in the latter half of this century, and (3) the evolution of a language rights ideology and subsequent resurgence and development of bilingual education during the 1970s and 1980s. This compartmentalization of second language studies into separate areas of research and program development, however, has consequently resulted in less than satisfactory progress for students across sociocultural/linguistic backgrounds. To adequately address student problems and goals, an understanding is needed of the potential for building relationships between foreign language teaching and language minority education.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Foreign language courses are popular electives in many secondary (and even primary) schools serving middle and upper class populations. In addition, foreign language study for one to two years is often required at state and private universities. With increased globalization and the corresponding need for fluency in languages other than English for business and diplomacy, enrollment in foreign language courses is currently higher than at any time since 1915 (Dandonoli, 1987). However, researchers (e.g., Hammond, 1988; Higgs & Clifford, 1982; Valette, 1991) note that mainstream students fail to achieve foreign language fluency through secondary and university course work. In effect, after four years of foreign language study, students have little ability to communicate in the language.

[1] There has been some recent application of theory from one field to another as well as a few collaboration ventures. For example, the relationships between second language acquisition and foreign language education are illustrated in VanPatten and Lee (1990). In addition, van Loenen and Haley (1994) instituted a "Consultative Model" in which bilingual education and ESL teachers collaborated in developing content-based curriculum in both the native language of students and English. Also, it's not uncommon for bilingual specialists to draw on second language acquisition theory and teaching methods. Finally, there has been contact between bilingual education and foreign language education with respect to immersion schooling.

Second language acquisition experts (e.g., Doughty & Pica, 1986; Long, 1983, 1996) suggest that, in order to facilitate the development of second language proficiency, learners should be given the opportunity to negotiate meaning through using the language for actual communicative purposes. Although universities often provide study abroad programs, these tend to be of limited duration (typically one semester) and thus do not allow sufficient language exposure to develop fluency. In addition, ideological and structural constraints (see Ortega, this volume) prevent foreign language teachers from engaging in classroom language experiences needed to facilitate foreign language development.

In sum, foreign language education in the US currently not only predominantly focuses on monolingual English-speaking communities, but it also fails to provide students from these communities with the ability to communicate in languages other than English.

LANGUAGE MINORITY EDUCATION

An increasing number of students attending public schools in the United States are non-native speakers of English. Gollnick (1992) estimates that by the year 2000, nearly 50% of the school population will be from language minority backgrounds. The past few decades have revealed the failure of most schools to meet the needs of this student population, as indicated by high drop-out rates, low standardized test scores, poor attendance records, and the small numbers of these students who go on to post-secondary education (see Arias, 1986; Brown & Haycock, 1984; Espinosa & Ochoa, 1986; Gingras, 1989; Medina, 1988; Orum, 1988; Rumberger, 1987).

Bilingual education specialists (e.g., Cummins, 1981, 1986, 1989; Fishman, 1979) have described the need for maintenance bilingual education among immigrant populations in terms of cognitive and socio-psychological advantages and basic social rights. In effect, research on bilingualism has shown that second language acquisition is most successful when there is a strong foundation in the mother tongue (Hakuta, 1985; Thomas & Collier, 1997). In a study of 700,000 student records in five large school systems over the course of 14 years, Thomas and Collier (1997) found that "Only those groups of language minority students who have received strong cognitive and academic development through their first language for many years (at least through Grade 5 or 6), as well as through the second language (English), are doing well in school as they reach the last of the high school years" (p. 14). They further report that evaluations of programs ranging from complete immersion to maintenance bilingual education indicate that the least successful students were those who were provided only with ESL Pullout or ESL Content classes. Yet the vast majority of newly arrived immigrants receive only a few hours per week of ESL (pullout) classes; only a few have the opportunity to learn content through their mother tongue and build upon their native language skills in bilingual programs. In fact, since the 1970s, bilingual education for immigrants has suffered a steady decline due to lack of funds (Title VII experienced severe cutbacks) and lack

of public support (ongoing appeals for "English Only" federal and state legislation) (see Jasso-Aguilar, this volume).

BILINGUAL MODELS OF EDUCATION

The major difficulty in providing immigrant students with the bilingual experience needed to facilitate academic achievement lies with inherent contradictions in the views held by many US educators towards bilingualism. Generally, immigrants' native language skills are devalued and disregarded. Thus, language minority children often lose pride and facility in their native language while failing to develop adequate academic abilities in English. On the other hand, although monolingual English speakers are encouraged to study other languages for enrichment purposes, they too fail to achieve bilingual ability.

Given that second language education is failing both native English-speakers and non-native English speakers, an alternative view of bilingual education in the United States is clearly needed. Fishman (1979) suggests:

> [Bilingual education]...could possibly be a powerful enrichment for...affluent American children, but such is our current blindness with respect to it that we largely insist on seeing it merely as 'something for the poor.' Nevertheless, it is in the latter *general* enrichment manifestation, as well as in the context of the self-maintenance efforts of our various non-Anglo cultural groups, that its true contribution to American education and society will ultimately be made (Fishman 1979:19).

In the twenty years since Fishman first recommended bilingual education for enrichment purposes, little progress has been made towards developing second language programs which would benefit students from both minority and English language backgrounds.

The ideal form of bilingual education for developing bilingualism across student populations is the two-way model. In this model, native speakers of English begin by learning content in English while studying a second language. As students develop fluency in the second language, content courses in that language are added until a balanced curriculum of both English and the second language is achieved. Immigrant students, on the other hand, begin learning content in their first language while studying English. Again, a balanced curriculum in both languages is eventually achieved and maintained throughout students' schooling. In addition to allowing for native and non-native speakers of English to develop oral fluency and literacy in two languages, this model has a number of additional advantages compared to other models. First, it allows students to keep pace with the school curriculum in their first language while acquiring a second language. Research has shown (Cummins, 1981; Thomas & Collier, 1997) that it takes between five and seven years for students to develop sufficient fluency in a second language to meet academic demands. Secondly, students are provided with built-in native-speaking

conversation partners in the second language. As mentioned above, research has shown that use of the second language for actual communicative purposes is essential to developing fluency (Doughty & Pica, 1986; Long, 1983, 1996; Long & Crookes, 1992).

Although the cognitive, social, and economic benefits of bilingualism are well-documented (e.g., Hakuta, 1986; Lopez, 1995), a number of myths and misunderstandings about language learning have prevented the implementation of bilingual education programs. In fact, most likely largely due to misinformation about second language acquisition disseminated to Californian voters, legislation (Proposition 227) was passed in the spring of 1998 which prohibits bilingual education in that state. The irony of Proposition 227 and similar federal and state proposals is that *all* students, that is, both immigrants and monolingual English speakers, can be harmed by any legislation which restricts the learning of languages other than English.

BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS

Given the prevailing misunderstandings about second language learning, bridges between foreign language teaching and language minority education need to be built in order to provide both native and non-native speakers of English with optimal opportunities for academic and socioeconomic achievement. There is a particular need for foreign language and ESL professionals to develop an awareness of the linguistic and cultural resources immigrants bring to educational settings and, subsequently, work together in developing language programs which utilize these resources.

This volume on *Foreign Language Teaching and Language Minority Education* seeks to examine the potential for building relationships among second language educators towards fostering bilingualism. In the first section of this volume, *Social and Poltical Contexts for Language Partnerships*, Jasso-Aguilar (chapter one) and Ortega (chapter two) examine current obstacles to developing bilingualism which are inherent in second language policies and programs. In chapter three, Syed and Burnett then suggest possible implications of issues associated with acculturation, identity, and language for linguistic minorities. Drawing on recent SLA and education theory, Syed further outlines in chapter four the possibilities and potential for developing collaboration and partnerships across primary, secondary, and tertiary institutions. In the second section, *Community Language as Resource*, the authors provide research findings on the *Foreign Language Partnership Project* designed to capitalize on the resources of immigrant students to enhance foreign language learning. Shonle and Thompson Rolland explore the language and educational development of project participants in chapter five while Burnett and Syed report in chapter six on issues of identity. The concluding section summarizes the potential benefits of and promise for language partnerships in second and foreign language situations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the United States Department of Education under the Language Resource Centers Program for its generous support of this project. However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and one should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

The hard work and fine scholarship of the contributors to this volume are also greatly appreciated. The contributors were graduate students during the project in the Department of English as a Second Language, College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature at the University of Hawai'i. Most were also graduate assistants in the Center for Second Language Research (CSLR) and/or in the National Foreign Language Resource Center (NFLRC) and, in those capacities, carried out the coordination of the project and the research reported in their sections. Finally, thanks are owed to CSLR graduate assistant Terri Menacker for her editorial assistance.

A summary account of this report will be found in K. Davis and R. Jasso-Acquilar (Eds.) (1997) *The Foreign Language Partnership Project* published by the Center for Second Language Research as a technical report. A video tape of the project, *Foreign Language Partnership* (Davis & Syed), is available from either of these two sources:

Center for Second Language Research
Department of ESL
1890 East West Road
Honolulu, HI 96822

phone: 808–956–5806
fax: 808–956–2802

NFLRC Publications
1859 East West Road #106
Honolulu, HI 96822

phone: 808–956–9851
fax: 808–956–5983
e-mail: mastersn @hawaii.edu
www.lll.hawaii.edu/nflrc/

REFERENCES

Arias, B. (1986). The context of education for Hispanic students: An overview. *American Journal of Education*, 95, 26–57.

Brown, P. R., & Haycock, K. (1984). *Excellence for whom?* Oakland, CA: The Achievement Council.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education, Office of Bilingual, Bicultural Education, *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3–50). Los Angeles: California State University, Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 372–390.

Cummins, J. (1989). Language and literacy acquisition in bilingual contexts. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 10*(1), 17–31.

Dandonoli, P. (1987). Report on foreign language enrollment in public secondary schools, Fall 1985. *Foreign Language Annals, 20*, 457–470.

Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1986). "Information gap" tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(2), 305–325.

Espinosa, R., & Ochoa, A. (1986). Concentration of California Hispanic students in schools with low achievement: A research note. *American Journal of Education*, 95, 77–95.

Fishman, J. (1979). Bilingual education: What and why? In H. Trueba & C. Barnett-Mizrahi (Eds.), *Bilingual Multicultural Education and the Professional: From Theory to Practice* (pp. 11–19). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Gingras, R. C., & Careaga, R. C. (1989). *Limited-English-Proficient students at risk: Issues and prevention strategies*. Silver Spring, MD: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Gollnick, D. (1992). Multicultural education: Policies and practices in teacher education. In C. Grant (Ed.), *Research and multicultural education: From the margins to the mainstream* (pp. 218–239). Washington DC: The Falmer Press.

Hakuta, K. (1985). Generalizations from research in second language acquisition and bilingualism, *Testimony presented before the House Education and Labor Committee*. Washington, DC.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language*. New York: Basic Books.

Hammond, R. M. (1988). Accuracy versus communicative competency: The acquisition of grammar in the second language classroom. *Hispania, 71*(2), 408–417.

Higgs, T. V., & Clifford, R. (1982). The push toward communication. In T. V. Higgs (Ed.), *Curriculum, competence, and the foreign language teacher* (pp. 57–79). Chicago, Illinois: National Textbook Company.

Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 126–141.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition* (Vol. 2: Second language acquisition). New York: Academic Press.

Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1), 27–58.

Lopez, R. (1995). Bilingual education: Separating fact from fiction. Washington, DC: National Association for Bilingual Education.

Medina, M. (1988). Hispanic apartheid in American public education. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 24*, 336–349.

Orum, L. S. (1988). *The education of Hispanics: Status and implications*. Washington, DC: National Council of La Raza.

Rumberger, R. W. (1987). High school dropouts: A review of issues and evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 57*, 101–121.

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997). School effectiveness for language minority students. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Valette, R. M. (1991). Proficiency and the prevention of fossilization: An editorial. *The Modern Language Journal, 75*(3), 325–328.

van Loenen, R., & Haley, P. K. (1994). Consultation and collaboration: English as a second language and regular classroom teachers working together. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372645)

VanPatten, B., & Lee, J. F. (Eds.) (1990). *Second Language Acquisition/Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

PART I

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONTEXTS FOR LANGUAGE PARTNERSHIPS

Rebeca Jasso-Aguilar
San Juan College Farmington, New Mexico

LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY IN THE US: HONORING LANGUAGE RIGHTS AND BUILDING ON LANGUAGE RESOURCES

MULTILINGUALISM: A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Throughout the world, and throughout history, monolingualism has been the odd exception rather than the rule (Bamgbose, 1991; Coulmas, 1988; Ferguson, Haughton & Wells, 1977). As Ferguson et al. write:

> ...most of the nations of the world are multilingual, and millions of children have their schooling in two or more languages. From the earliest days of civilization, bilingual education has been important in the development of society and culture. There has hardly been a time in recorded history when a nation could flourish as a monolingual entity with a completely monolingual educational system. Soldiers and statesmen, poets and kings have always needed more than one language in which to communicate (p. 159).

In ancient Mesopotamia, rulers and their subordinates as well as men of commerce learned languages other than their mother tongue, and bilingualism was essential to artistic and intellectual creativity. The first evidence of children studying using two languages for their schoolwork comes from this period. By the second millennium BC, a pattern of bilingual education was well established, prevailing throughout the Near East, from Elam and the Bahrain Islands in the Persian Gulf, to the Hittite Kingdom in Central Asia Minor, to the western area between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean Coast, and to Cyprus and Egypt (Oppenheim, 1967). In the third century BC both upper and lower classes of Roman society enjoyed humorous plays in Greek, and the Romans based their education on the study of literature of a foreign language (Wilkins, 1905).

Many nations today have complex patterns of multilingual education. We only need to look at countries like India, with over 150 different languages of which fourteen are officially recognized as regional languages and used as the medium of instruction in public schools; or China, where there are a number of separate spoken Chinese languages with a single written language; or South American countries, where Spanish or Portuguese is the school language for many who speak Indian languages natively; or Africa, which has at least 1000 languages-some 100 different Bantu languages in the Congo alone (Ferguson et al., 1977).

Jasso-Aguilar, R. (1999). Language planning and policy in the US: Honoring language rights and building on language resources. In K. A. Davis (Ed.), *Foreign language teaching and language minority education*. (Technical Report #19, pp. 3–19). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Nor should one assume that multilingualism and bilingual education are limited to the "so-called Third World" (Ferguson et al., 1977, p. 161). In Great Britain there are still some functioning Welsh bilingual schools in Wales, in spite of the fact that English has been used for centuries[1]. In Norway, local schools have the option of choosing one of the two closely related literary standard languages that exist. Switzerland has four official languages which are used in schools: French, German, Italian, and Romanch (German-speaking Switzerland has two distinct varieties). Even in countries that are essentially monolingual, such as Sub-Saharan Madagascar, Lesotho, and Somalia, multilingualism exists and bilingual education is available in languages like Arabic, Italian, and English (Ferguson et al., 1977).

MULTILINGUALISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Similarly, the United States has never been a monolingual country (Ferguson & Heath, 1981; Fishman, 1988). Prior to the arrival of the Europeans there were nations which had their own peculiar rituals, culture, and language; indeed, more than five hundred languages were spoken in North America (Castellanos, 1983). When Europeans arrived in the New World and established schools, vernacular education was the rule, whether in English or another tongue. New arrivals naturally strove to preserve their heritage, and language loyalties were strong. In many parts of the US, thus, bilingual instruction was often the rule rather than the exception (Crawford, 1989; Gonzalez, 1979). "It is quite obvious that this nation was born multilingual and multicultural, despite the indisputable fact that English became accepted as a lingua franca," writes Castellanos (1983).

Indeed, the history of the United States is filled with examples of times when monolingualism was more the exception than the rule:

> In the 16th century at least eighteen languages were spoken on Manhattan Island, not counting Indian languages. Bilingualism was common among the working class as well as the educated in the 17th century, especially in the middle colonies of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware (Crawford, 1989; Gonzales 1979; Leibowitz, 1971).
>
> At the time California became a state, private schools, which were initially state supported and composed about 18% of all education, were composed of pupils mainly of Spanish descent who were taught in the Spanish language (Leibowitz, 1971).
>
> In 1884 a school law was passed in New Mexico which recognized the public Spanish-language elementary schools (Leibowitz, 1971).
>
> In the 18th century the Cherokees' educational system produced a population 90% literate in its native language and bilingual to the extent that Oklahoma Cherokees

[1] Celtic languages are, in fact, currently undergoing a powerful resurgence (see the *Guardian Weekly*, December 15, 1996).

had a higher English literacy level than the white population of either Texas or Arkansas (Crawford, 1989; Leibowitz, 1971).

From 1776 to around the mid-nineteenth century, multilingualism was accepted as a common, even desirable, phenomenon befitting a nation of immigrants (Molesky, 1988). Not only was it accepted as a fact of life, but the Continental Congress accommodated significant groups of non-English speakers, publishing many official documents in German and French, including Articles of the Confederation. Multiple languages played critical roles in the political and social life of the nation during the early national period and the choice of a single language as the official language was never made. A democracy, after all, was not supposed to tell its citizens how to talk (Crawford, 1992a; Heath, 1992). No one celebrated bilingualism or diversity but few fretted about it, and few fears were expressed about the potential threat of multilingualism to national unity, probably because there was so much to quarrel about and because minority groups were neither more nor less likely to support Independence than the English-speaking groups (Crawford, 1989, 1992b; Molesky, 1988). This is not to say that linguistic minorities did not face policies of exclusion or coercive assimilation or both. There are examples of these types of policies at various points in history: the imposition of English-only boarding schools on Native American children in the 1880s; the 1897 English-proficiency requirement for miners in Pennsylvania; and the push by Republicans for an English literacy test for Yiddish speakers to vote in 1921 in New York (Crawford, 1992b). These policies of exclusion, however, were a different matter than what English Only represents today. While there are precedents for language restriction and repression in American history, the claim that the nation's common language is endangered represents a new political phenomenon (Schmid, 1992).

ONE FLAG, ONE LANGUAGE, ONE NATION?

To understand the phenomenon of "one flag, one language, one nation," it is important to introduce some terminology used in the sociology of language. The term *nationality* refers to an ethnic group that has developed beyond primarily local self-concepts and concerns, and may also have a larger and more complex level of sociocultural integration than ethnic groups do (Fishman, 1972). In Fishman's definition it is not necessary for there to be some polity entity corresponding to a nationality: many nationalities live within the borders of states governed by other nationalities. In fact, when a nationality largely or increasingly controls a political unit it becomes what Fishman calls a *nation*. In this scheme, *nationalism* refers to the feelings that support and develop a nation while *nationism* refers to the more pragmatic problems of governing. A language used for nationalist purposes is a *national language*, while the one used for nationist purposes is an *official language* (Fasold, 1984, 1988), although in practice the national language can correspond with the official language, and governments may recognize and sanction more than one language as official (Sonntag, 1995). A national language can be compared to the national flag, in the sense that both function almost entirely as symbols representing national unity and commonalty among people (Fasold, 1988; Sonntag,

1995). An official language is recognized and sanctioned by a government for use in official business conducted by and in governmental institutions, a uniform code regarded as a matter of administrative convenience for governing a country (Fasold, 1984, 1988; Sonntag, 1995).

Most supporters of the Official English amendment, however, are less concerned with pragmatic issues like schooling for non-English-speaking students than with illegal aliens on welfare, communities being "overrun" by Asian and Hispanics, "macho-oriented" foreigners trying to impose their culture on Americans, and the out-of-control birthrates of linguistic minorities. In fact, the call that many supporters have for Official English is "Whose America is this? One flag. One language" (Crawford, 1992a, p. 4). The misleading nature of Official English propaganda is no accident by any means. Although proponents have argued that they are only concerned with the language of governing and not with private speech, and have objected to having their position equated with English-Only (the largest Official English lobbying group), they were skillful in linking language to God and Country sentiments: national unity, loyalty, strength of purpose (Crawford, 1992a), and turning it into a nationalist movement, a political *language movement* (Sonntag, 1995, see further in this chapter). This might have been possible because nowadays many people, especially in the Western world, take for granted that there is a providential bond between language and nation (Coulmas, 1988).

From a central government's standpoint it may be true that a common language forges similarity of attitudes and values which can have important unifying aspects, while different languages tend to make direction from the center more difficult. Balancing the role that a non-national mother tongue plays for its citizenry has been every Federal government's concern: on the one hand the annealing, reproductive, harmonizing effects resulting from the comfort of its use by members who are somewhat alien to the culture of the dominant society, and on the other the divisive potential brought on by its retention and strengthening. But if minority language use can breed problems, its suppression by public authorities leads to bitterness and estrangement to the very government which is trying to create loyalty and devotion in this alien section of the population (Leibowitz, 1978). Thus, while the idea of a national language and its political enforcement may be said to function as a cohesive force, the reverse is also true. The real question about the national language idea, and in the US, the Official English idea, is whether language can be politically instrumentalized without becoming a means of suppression and making it more difficult for different language groups to live together peacefully (Coulmas, 1988).

Languages have always been used to establish or claim a sphere of influence. Therefore, where linguistic diversity exists, the effort to establish a national language with ideological zeal is bound to generate conflict. Ideally, the multiplicity of languages of a given country should be stressed as a matter of pride, while restricting the language for communication to a practical convenience without any sentimental value (Coulmas, 1988). Switzerland, a country with four official

languages, is an example of acceptance and celebration of diversity. In Switzerland, as a national community formed of four linguistic/cultural populations, pluralism has an imperative national value, and its successful application in the life of the Republic is seen as providing a lesson for humankind that must be learned if social peace and order are ultimately to be achieved. Pluralism is not just seen as a value or as an historical achievement or as the reason for national existence but as something that provides the means by which the people of the Swiss Republic may surmount the limitations inherent in membership in a single ethnic group and gain access to additional cultural influences. Pluralism to the Swiss has far greater scope and dimension than is generally attached to "tolerance" of ethnic differences, and it represents an entirely different situation to pluralism in the US, where the "melting pot" theory has discouraged multiculturalism in the name of assimilation into one culture. The Official English amendment is an attempt not merely to recognize one language, but to restrict the use of other languages in government and other domains (Crawford, 1992b).

The Bilingual Education Act, with all its positive aspects, was mostly based on a remedial/compensatory model of minority-group education; the ultimate goal was to move children out of functional bilingualism and into monoglot instruction, with complete disregard for basic principles of human development and the role that linguistic and cultural continuity plays in development (Gonzalez, 1979). It was aimed at children who were both poor and "educationally disadvantaged because of their inability to speak English" (Clyne 1986; Crawford, 1989). So much for celebration of linguistic and cultural diversity.

Considering the multilingual character of most countries it is by no means self-evident why linguistic pluralism should be regarded as a problem (Coulmas, 1988). It has been noted that language differences within a polity do not in themselves lead to disruption of national unity, and that political movements centered upon a language can affect frontiers "only during key moments in the history of ethnic and national groupings" (Beer, 1985, p. 216; Weinstein, 1979, p. 362). What is implied by both Beer and Weinstein is that, when linguistic pluralism is regarded as a problem, there are broader issues at stake than just language differences. The 1897 English-proficiency requirement for miners in Pennsylvania, for example, sought to ban Italians and Slavs from the coal fields, and the literacy test for Yiddish speakers in 1921 was pushed by Republicans hoping to disfranchise one million Yiddish voters who usually elected Democrats. The desire for the land owned and occupied by the Indians was one of the motives behind the "civilizing" campaigns of the 19th century (Leibowitz, 1980).

In the United States bilingual education has been likely to be accepted in areas where language minority-groups had influence, and to be rejected where they had none. Local officials have often bent the law to permit native-language classes, as a way to ensure immigrant parents' support of the public schools (Crawford, 1989). Further analysis of the record indicates that official acceptance or rejection of bilingualism in American schools has been dependent upon whether the group involved is considered politically and socially acceptable. The decision to impose

English as the exclusive language of instruction in the schools have reflected the popular attitudes towards the particular ethnic group and the degree of hostility evidenced towards that group's natural development. If the group is in some ways (because of race, color, or religion) viewed as irreconcilably alien to the prevailing concept of American culture, the United States has imposed harsh restrictions on its language practices; if not so viewed, study in the native language has gone largely unquestioned and even encouraged. As might have been expected, language restriction was only one limitation to be imposed. These language restrictions were always coupled with other discriminatory legislation and practices in other fields, including private indignities of various kinds, which made it clear that the issue was a broader one. To the minority group affected, this was very clear and, therefore, it was the act of imposition itself which created the reaction by the minority group rather than the substantive effects of the policy (Leibowitz, 1978).

CURRENT SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

In spite of all these precedents for language restrictionism and discrimination, Official English caught most Americans by surprise. In the early 1980s, when the campaign emerged, language was an unlikely political issue: it was difficult to imagine that English would need legal protection in a country where only 11 percent of all residents are regular speakers of another language (Crawford, 1992a).

Official English corresponds to what Sonntag (1995) calls a political language movement, where the goal of the leaders is redistribution and redefinition of power relations in a country. The leaders, established elite supporters of the status quo, while holding the power within the national unit have been unable to find genuine solutions to socioeconomic problems, and feel threatened by new agendas and alignments (Fishman, 1988; Sonntag, 1995). Official language movements have the potential for establishing a new agenda and a new way to talk about political and socioeconomic issues, substituting language conflict and its terms of reference for the existing alignments of political and socioeconomic conflict (Sonntag, 1995). The new discourse of the Official English movement becomes misleading rhetoric: people supporting it have expressed doing so because "it would make sure that people who need to communicate for health and safety reasons always can do so," and "it would make it easier for people who come to this country and don't speak English to eventually get ahead," both very unlikely outcomes as experience has shown (Crawford, 1992a, 1992b; Dicker 1992). Statements like "soon after the passage of the Bilingual Education Act immigrant rates exploded," spoken by one leader of the English Only group, are also misinformative and create anti-immigrant sentiment, since the temptation to blame general malaise on those who look or sound different is great (Dicker, 1992; Donahue, 1985).

Not surprisingly, US English and allied groups seem to be promoting a "hidden agenda," seeking scapegoats for social ills that have little to do with language (Fishman, 1988). Intimately connected with the anti-immigrant lobby, they represent a political opinion which has seized on the Official English issue to

conceal a wide variety of reactionary and destabilizing sentiments which threaten the ethnic groups of America's political minorities, and attempt to foster resentment towards those who are now encouraged and willing to retain a portion of their ethnic background. It is counter to the earliest American intellectual tradition: that of tolerance of, and respect for, individual rights (Crawford, 1992b; Donahue, 1985).

There is no simple answer to what the legal impact of the Official English amendment would be, since the language rights in question are poorly defined in American law (Crawford, 1992a). On the surface there should be no relationship between the language a government uses and the language used in state ballots and in school, but when a prominent political ideology attempts to strengthen itself through exclusionary methods, both minority voting rights and promotional language rights are viewed as expendable (Donahue, 1985). The clearly restrictive nature of Official English would give the language practices of the majority a constitutional sanction, while threatening the civil and constitutional rights of citizens with little or no English proficiency, rights that have been built up slowly and arduously by minorities (Crawford, 1992b; Donahue, 1985). As the Constitution currently stands there is not much to help people learn English; ironically, an Official English amendment not only would not help but would add much to penalize those who have yet to do so (Crawford, 1992a, 1992b).

Although English Only legislation proponents have yet to produce measures terminating government-sponsored bilingual programs, opponents warn that some proposed versions of a federal English Language Amendment would have sweeping consequences in areas such as social, health, and emergency services, housing, employment, education, taxation, voting, due process, consumer and environmental programs, motor vehicle licensing, and general services, with devastating effects in states with large populations of non or limited English-speaking people (Crawford, 1992b). In Duenas Gonzalez' (1991) words "understanding the motivations and strategies of US English makes clear the intentions of this powerful group: to deprive one group of Americans [of] their rights."

LANGUAGE RIGHTS AND THE NEED FOR A LANGUAGE POLICY

OVERVIEW

As Crawford (1992a) suggests, "It is time that Americans had a constructive discussion about language policy, indeed, *that we have a language policy*, consciously planned and national in scope" (p. 5).

Some definitions seem appropriate to understand the importance of language planning and language policy. Language planning consists of "deliberate, institutionally organized attempts at affecting the linguistic or sociolinguistic status or development of languages" (Nahir, 1984; cited in Cloonan & Strine, 1991, p.

269); it is usually a sustained, conscious and long-term governmental effort to alter the functions of a language in a society (Weinstein, 1980). From these perspectives, government policies concerning language status are intentional efforts to aid or stem the development of minority languages, or any language, in a society (Kloss, 1969; cited in Cloonan & Strine, 1991, p. 269). Language policy has been considered to result from an interaction between central government's espoused values and perceptions of political and economic needs (Peddie, 1991), but Bamgbose (1989) recommends that these perceptions should come from decentralized bureaucratic agencies rather than from comprehensive planning, as they better reflect the needs of the community. Bamgbose suggestion indeed highlights the vital role of grass-roots participation.

Ruiz (1988) identifies three societal and institutional orientations in language planning: language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource. Language-as-problem manifests itself predominantly in the context of national development corresponding to a Western model, equating languages other than English and circumstantial bilingualism with social and economic problems and suggesting that economic disadvantage is inherent in the language-minority situation. The language-as-right orientation draws on the natural and legal rights for minority groups to fight discrimination on the basis of language. Language-as-resource acknowledges the importance of majority and minority languages in the social, educational, and economic spheres of the modern world, and it is concerned with language development as well as conservation of existing languages.

Many have argued that language rights are human rights, since language is essential to human life, and it plays a critical role in defining individual identity, culture and community membership (MacMillan 1982; also cf. McDonald 1991). Language rights would include individual language rights as well as communal language rights, the first ones representing the right not to experience undue interference or discrimination on the basis of language, the latter ones being the kinds of rights vested in a given community on the grounds that the protection of their language is at the core of their communal membership and identity. In practice, individual rights mean the right to speak the native language on the streets and for private correspondence, to keep native names and surnames, and to use the native language in cultural and religious institutions. Supporters of linguistic *laissez-faire* will usually argue that these language rights are sufficient, and that no one can assert additional language rights on the grounds that they are members of a particular community. The problem with this view is that state neutrality is not neutral in its effects, since it favors the dominant language in terms of its use and prestige, often concealing hegemonic practices[2] and leaving minority languages vulnerable to them. Supporters of a laissez-faire approach suggest that the forces of competition within the free market are not conducive to the growth of minority languages nor to the

[2] As defined in Erickson, 1987; "Hegemonic practices are routine actions and unexamined beliefs that are consonant with the cultural system of meaning and ontology within which it makes sense to take certain actions, entirely without malevolent intent, that nonetheless systematically limits the life chances of stigmatized groups." (p. 352)

harmonious coexistence of a plurality of languages (Coulombe, 1993), thus ignoring the issue of language rights.

A variant of the *laissez-faire* position is to recommend protection of the weaker languages but placing the duty on the community members themselves. This argument blames the individual for language decline or language loss, dismissing the subtle effects of assimilation that translate into "choice" of the dominant language which stems not only from the individuals desire to integrate or to assure upward mobility, but from the community's lack of expressive power, recognition, and self-respect. Clearly, sustaining minority languages requires more than a *laissez-faire* stance and merely recommending protection against conventional discrimination. If language rights per se is often insufficient, accounting for language rights justifies more extensive language planning under certain circumstances. Some degree of state intervention is necessary if languages are to be truly protected, designing and implementing policies ranging from state funding for minority language education to far more reaching ones like a community's right to live and communicate in its own language (Coulombe, 1993).

There is another perspective of language rights, what Akinnasso (1994) calls the right-to-language and which is the right to access the State's legitimate or dominant language(s), including the right to learn even a foreign language in the belief that such knowledge might bring certain benefits. While language-as-right problems arise when certain languages are marginalized and deprived of recognition and resources for development, thereby reducing their "exchange value" in the labor market (Coulmas, 1992), right-to-language problems arise when certain languages are privileged over others, by being officially recognized, developed, and legitimated by formal institutions. As can be seen, both perspectives entail complementary processes of empowerment, one seeking to ensure that minority languages are developed and maintained, while the other seeking to ensure that minority groups acquire the appropriate symbolic capital that would guarantee access to the labor market. A critical situation can develop when trying to meet a dual objective: how to provide linguistic minorities with access to the dominant languages without denigrating their first languages and without requiring them to assimilate into the dominant language and culture (Akinnaso, 1994).

Keeping in mind the uniqueness of each situation, it is useful and wise to look at how other countries with similar population make-ups have coped with linguistic and cultural diversity.

THE AUSTRALIAN EXPERIENCE

The language situation in Australia is similar in many respects to that of the United States seventy years ago, when higher immigration rates prevailed: both are former colonies of England and English is the dominant tongue; both also have many other languages, spoken by indigenous peoples as well as by immigrants; in both countries English was preceded by many indigenous languages. Since World War II Australia has encouraged high rates of immigration, to the extent that about one half the

present population are first or second-generation immigrants. There are at least ten languages (besides English) spoken in Australia by more than 50,000 people. As in the United States, English has long been the *de facto* national language, but it was never enshrined as the *official* language. Language policy in Australia underwent rapid change during the last two decades, the principal development being the emergence of a powerful movement on behalf of minority language rights. This began with an aboriginal civil rights movement in the early 1970s, in which a variety of aboriginal rights were legally established: rights to land, language, education, and maintenance of traditional culture. Federally funded programs in support of language maintenance and development, bilingual education, and literacy in traditional tongues were established. The next minority rights movement involved immigrants, which led to the establishment of the principle of equal access to information and services by speakers of minority languages, through the provision of interpreting and translation services, bilingual publications, and so forth. Next was the recognition of the validity of efforts to preserve and develop the linguistic and cultural heritage of the communities: developing after-school programs for their children to acquire literacy in their native languages, and these "ethnic schools" being in some ways supported by and partially integrated into the public school system. Another significant step was the creation of a public multicultural broadcasting network. The culmination of these developments in Australian language policy was the discovery of linguistic diversity as a national resource, and the promulgation in 1987 of an official National Policy on Languages (Crawford, 1992a).

Some flaws have been identified in the Australian model of language policy, especially as it has evolved over the decade since its inception: that it is the work of a single author, that it relies heavily on the education system, and that it followed a top-down approach to planning (Eggington, 1994; Moore, 1996). What Eggington appears to suggest is that a strong grass-roots commitment to language maintenance was not part of the language planning process. This lack of commitment seems to be an indication of the low esteem in which all languages, except English, are held in Australia (Bettoni & Leal, 1994). The policy has also been attacked because of its focus on English literacy at the expense of other literacies and for its focus on learning languages of economic importance rather than on community language maintenance and development (Clyne, 1991; Ingram, 1991; cited in Eggington, 1994; Moore 1996), two facts which would violate the language rights mentioned by Akinnasso (1994). Baldauf (1993) advocates a lowering of expectations for policy outcomes.

NEW ZEALAND'S CASE

Peddie (1991) reports a somewhat opposite approach in the creation of New Zealand's language policy. He points out that, in the case of New Zealand, there is no clear central planning and not much available data —concerning language use and geographic distribution of languages in New Zealand— needed for sound policy development. Nevertheless, political pressure from the indigenous Maori people and

from community and other language interest groups appears to have interacted positively with espoused government values on partnership and equity.

Since the early 1970s a number of developments have occurred that affect language policy which appear to be happening with specific sectors of language interest groups rather than in a coherent way. For Maori people, for example, revitalization of the Maori language is the major issue. There has been a dramatic rise in the number of schools teaching Maori, the most dramatic being the development of *Kohanga Reo*, or Maori pre-school "language nests." Begun by Maori people in the early 1980s, they have received only limited financial assistance from government departments, but nevertheless there are currently over 500 of these pre-school communities, catering to more than one in four of all Maori children under the age of five (G. H. Smith, personal communication; cited in Peddie, 1991, p. 29).

Some migrant communities have started their own pre-school "language nests," at the same time that the on-going flow of migration has resulted in significant needs for English as a second language. The 1987 curriculum review for primary and secondary schools included several recommendations aimed at language support for Maori and overseas students, and resource development to assist the maintenance of Pacific Island languages at school. Of particular importance is the recommendation that "a national policy on languages [be] developed, embracing Maori, English, Pacific Island languages, foreign languages, English as a second language; and including first language learning" (*The Curriculum Review* 1987, p. 41; cited in Peddie, 1991, pp. 33–34).

Peddie suggests that, with the exception of the Maori language, it is only recently that language issues are becoming socially, politically and economically recognized, as opposed to being perceived just as educational issues. Still, policy development has been located within the Ministry of Education, a fact that could lead to action but could also result in critical aspects of policy being limited to the educational sector.

Peddie also seems to advocate the notion of language as a resource that Australia had embraced, by suggesting that diversification of trading patterns and seeking new markets overseas, as well as needs in tourism, will in time allow the language strengths of the country to be celebrated and valued, instead of being perceived as irrelevant or problematic. He concludes that, in New Zealand's case, the language policy development is neither "top down" nor "bottom up," but depends on the espoused values of the government as well as in the correspondence of these values with political, economic, linguistic and especially educational necessities perceived by government to be significant to the nation.

LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY IN HAWAI'I

Hawai'i has a unique language and cultural history. Hawaiian was the language of the Hawaiian Islands for their first centuries, until Western contact began with Captain Cook in 1788 and continued with trade and the arrival of the American

missionaries in 1820. The status of English language grew with the power and influence of the missionaries and their descendants. In 1894, with the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy by American businessmen, English was declared the official medium of instruction for public schools. Around the turn of the century there was a period of strong multilingualism, due to the massive numbers of immigrants brought to Hawai'i to work the sugar plantations. Speakers of diverse languages, mainly Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, Portuguese, and Puerto Rican, with limited access to English, created Hawaiian Pidgin English (HPE) as a common medium of communication. HPE evolved into Hawaiian Creole English (HCE) when it became the first language of the children of HPE speakers (Menacker, 1995). During the first half of the 20th century the Department of Education used English Standard schools as a means of racial segregation, by separating Caucasian English speakers from the rest of the population; there were also attempts to abolish Japanese language schools and Americanization campaigns which advocated strong assimilationism (Sato, 1991; cited in Menacker, 1995).

In the period since statehood in 1959, a number of issues related to language have occurred: English and Hawaiian have been designated Hawai'i's official languages; HCE has become a strong marker of local identity and has withstood the opposition of educators; and accent discrimination cases have been tried in the courts. Hawaiian language learning is growing rapidly through revival efforts and Hawaiian immersion programs for children. Currently most people in Hawai'i are of Asian or Pacific Island decent and no single group is a numerical majority. New immigrant groups have arrived from Vietnam, Laos, Samoa, Mexico and elsewhere, seeking a place in the Hawaiian community. Problems of access to state services such as health care, legal aid, and other essential services present dramatic life or death examples of the impact of language policies on community members. Loss of self-esteem, identity, economic opportunity, and political power are also subtle, although by no means less powerful, ways in which language policies and plans affect individuals (Menacker, 1995).

For the last ten years language issues have become recognized in the social, political, and economic arena. The Hawaiian language has been undergoing a powerful renaissance, thanks to the efforts of many native Hawaiians. Immersion preschools (*Pūnana Leo*) and schools (*Kula Kaiapuni*) provide education in the Hawaiian language to over 1000 children, from preschool through 12th grade. Interested parties recognize that the language needs to be continually nurtured through programs for children and for adults, and their efforts have also aimed at promoting Hawaiian language use at home, ensuring that parents and other adults begin speaking Hawaiian to their children (Henze, 1996).

As for heritage languages, for the last three years, a project was developed to counteract prevailing "English Only" attitudes by facilitating language acquisition among foreign language learners while maintaining native languages and raising self-esteem among immigrants. The project, called the Foreign Language Partnership Project, has three objectives which intend to reconceptualize the idea of language as a resource (Ruiz, 1988): (a) to address the low academic achievement

among historically under-served minority students; (b) to address low oral and literacy proficiency among university level foreign language learners; and (c) to address national needs for a bilingual workforce for international business and other purposes (see Shonle in this volume).

Recently, language conferences, press coverage, and community activism have highlighted language issues. The Hawai'i Council on Language Planning and Policy has been formed by individuals brought together by a commitment to development of a language plan and policy. Language Council members include language rights advocates, representatives of the state and county agencies, teachers and experts in applied linguistics and English as a second language, Hawaiian language immersion advocates, interpreters, translators, immigrant and refugee service providers, and community organizations. The Council intends to serve as a forum as well, where cooperation among bilingual experts and educators in foreign languages and ESL is fostered and their voices are heard, within the context of a comprehensive language plan.

CONCLUSIONS

Considering the historical tradition of multilingualism, it is time that the language strengths of a country be celebrated and valued, instead of being perceived as irrelevant or problematic. It is important to examine the cases in which there have been attempts to develop multilingual language plans and policies, and to learn from them. Lessons to be learned from Australia and New Zealand are that a top-down approach, and heavily relying on the education system is not conducive to a long term, harmonious development of a language policy, but neither is linguistic *laissez-faire*. Peddie's (1991) theory of language policy development, which depends on the espoused values of the government as well as on the coinciding of these values with political, economic, linguistic, and especially educational necessities perceived by government to be significant to the nation, suggests a commitment on the part of the government, but it also implies the danger that development of languages of economic importance will be favored over community language maintenance and development. Furthermore, language rights are in danger of being overlooked if they cannot prove their political or economic value. It is crucial to recognize the existence of language rights so that they can be protected. This theory also seems to imply that grassroots efforts play a secondary role in planning, and that they will be considered only when the government perceives them as relevant to the nation. However, there are other nations that have had to cope with linguistic diversity, and in doing so have followed a grassroots orientation in which regional, state, and local governments are encouraged to initiate their own development projects. In Nigeria, for example, such grassroots efforts are already having some impact on local traditions, languages, and even dialects (Akinnaso, 1994).

Finally, let us turn to the case of Hawai'i, whose success in the Hawaiian language renaissance and in the formation of a language council has been the result of grassroots efforts. A Hawai'i language policy, seeking to promote inclusiveness,

diversity, multilingualism, and multiculturalism, will aim to highlight the value of a multilingual population for successful participation in a global economy. In times when multilingualism elsewhere is perceived as a threat to a harmonious society and treated as a handicap rather than as a resource, a multilingual policy would be the first step in a plan for a viable internationalized future, one in which communication in languages of Asia and the Pacific will play a major role, along with English, and one in which the principles of language rights and a democratic society will be fully articulated.

REFERENCES

Akinnaso, F. N. (1994). Linguistic unification and language rights. *Applied Linguistics, 15*(2), 139–168.

Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (1993). Fostering bilingualism and national development through school second language study. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 14*(1&2), 1–14.

Bamgbose, A. (1989). Issues for a model of language planning. *Language Problems and Language Planning. 13*(1), 24–34.

Bamgbose, A. (1991). *Language and the nation.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Beer, W. R. (1985). Toward a theory of linguistic mobilization. In W. R. Beer & J. E. Jacob, (Eds.), *Language policy and national unity* (pp. 217–235). Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.

Bettoni, C., & Leal, B. (1994). Multiculturalism and modern languages in Australian Universities. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 18*(1), 19–37.

Billigmeier, R. H. (1979). *A crisis in Swiss pluralism: The Romansch and their relations with the German- and Italian-Swiss in the perspective of millennium.* The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Castellanos, D. (1983). A polyglot nation. In J. Crawford, (Ed.), *Language loyalties* (pp. 13–18). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cloonan, J. D., & Strine, J. M. (1991). Federalism and the development of language policy: Preliminary investigations. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 15*(3), 268–281.

Clyne, M. (1986). Comment: Language rights and the English Language Amendment. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 60*, 139–143.

Clyne, M. (1991). Australia's language policies: Are we going backwards? [Commentary on the book, *Language rights and the English Language Amendment*] *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, Series S,*(8), 3–22.

Coulmas, F. (1988). What is a national language good for? In F. Coulmas, (Ed.), *With forked tongues: What are national languages good for?* (pp. 1–24). Singapore: Karoma.

Coulmas, F. (1992). *Language and economy.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Coulombe, P. (1993). Language rights, individual and communal. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 17*, 2, 141–152.

Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice*. Trenton, NJ: Crane.

Crawford, J. (1992a). *Language loyalties*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Crawford, J. (1992b). *Hold your tongue*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

The Curriculum Review. (1987). Report of the Committee to Review the Curriculum for Schools. Wellington: Department of Education.

Dicker, S. (1992). Examining the myths of language and cultural diversity: A response to Rosalie Pedalino Porter's *Forked tongue: The politics of bilingual education*. *Bilingual Review, 17*(3), 210–230.

Donahue, T. (1985). US English: Its life and works. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 56*, 99–112.

Donahue, T. (1995). American language policy and compensatory opinion. In J. W. Tollefson, (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language education*, 112–141. The Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Duenas Gonzalez, R. (1991). *Fundamentals of court interpretation: Theory, policy, and practice*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

Eggington, W. (1994). Language planning and policy in Australia. *Annual Review in Applied Linguistics, 14*, 137–155.

Fasold, R. (1984). *The sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Fasold, R. (1988). What national languages are for. In F. Coulmas, (Ed.), *With forked tongues: What are national languages good for?* (pp. 180–185). Singapore: Karoma.

Ferguson, C. A., & Heath, S. B. (1981). *Language use in the USA*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferguson, C., Houghton, C., & Wells, M. (1977). Bilingual education: An international perspective. In B. Spolsky & R. Cooper, (Eds.), *Frontiers of bilingual education* (pp. 159–174). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Fishman, J. (1972). *Language and nationalism*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Fishman, J. (1988). English only: Ghosts, myths, dangers. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 74*, 125–139.

Gonzalez, J. (1979). Coming of age in bilingual/bicultural education: A historical perspective. In H. Trueba & C. Barnett-Mizrahi, (Eds.), *bilingual multicultural education and the professional: From theory to practice* (pp. 1–10). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Heath, S. B. (1992). Why no single tongue? In J. Crawford, (Ed.), *Language loyalties* (pp. 20–31). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Henze, R. (1996). *Common myths about bilingualism*. Honolulu, HI: Hawai'i Council on Language Planning and Policy.

Ingram, D. (1991). Review of the 'White Paper' on language policy in Australia: Australia's language — the Australian language and literacy policy. *Babel*, *26*(3), 4–14.

Kloss, H. (1969). *Research possibilities on group bilingualism: A report*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

Leibowitz, A. (1971). *Educational policy and political acceptance: The imposition of English as the language of instruction in American schools*. Washington, DC: ERIC/CAL.

Leibowitz, A. (1978). Language policy in the United States. In H. LaFontaine, B. Persky, & L. Golubchick, (Eds.), *Bilingual education* (pp. 3–15). Wayne, NJ: Avery.

Leibowitz, A. (1980). *The Bilingual Education Act: A legislative analysis*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

MacMillan, M. (1982). Henri Bourassa on the defense of language rights. *Dalhousie Review*, *62*(3), 413–430.

McDonald, M. (1991). Should communities have rights? Reflections on liberal individualism. *The Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence*, *4*(2), 217–237.

Menacker, T. (1995). *Towards access and equity in multilingual contexts: Language planning and policy in Hawai'i*. Scholarly paper, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu.

Molesky, J. (1988). Understanding the American linguistic mosaic: A historical overview of language maintenance and language shift. In S. McKay & C. Wong, (Eds.), *Language diversity: Problem or resource?* (pp. 29–69). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Moore, H. (1996). Language policies as virtual reality: Two Australian examples. *TESOL Quarterly*, *30*(3), 473–498.

Nahir, Moshe, 1984. Language planning goals: A classification. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, *8*(3), 294–323.

Oppenheim, A. L. (1967). *Translator: An introduction to* Letters from Mesopotamia. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

Peddie, R. A. (1991). Coming — ready or not? Language policy development in New Zealand. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, *15*(1), 25–42.

Ruiz, R. (1988). Orientations in language planning. In S. McKay & C. Wong, (Eds.), *Language diversity: Problem or resource?* (pp. 3–25). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Sato, C. J. (1991). Sociolinguistic variation and language attitudes in Hawai'i. In J. Cheshire (Ed.), *English around the world* (pp. 647–663). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmid, C. (1992). The English Only movement: Social bases of support and opposition among Anglos and Latinos. In J. Crawford, (Ed.), *Language loyalties*, (pp. 202–209). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sonntag, S. K. (1995). Elite competition and official language movements. In J. W. Tollefson, (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language education* (pp. 91–111). The Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weinstein, B. (1979). Language strategists: Redefining political frontiers on the basis of linguistic choices. *World Politics, 31*(3), 345–364.

Weinstein, B. (1980). Language planning in francophone Africa. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 4*(1), 55–77.

Wilkins, A. (1905). *Roman education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lourdes Ortega
University of Hawai'i

RETHINKING FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION: POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF THE PROFESSION

INTRODUCTION

In the processes of professional development and institutional change, it is often beneficial to reflect on the goals and aims of one's profession and of the institutions associated with it. If teaching practitioners, educators, and scholars can agree that one of the main goals of education is the realization of true multilingualism and multiculturalism in schools and in society at large, then it may be possible for the different second language professional bodies to join efforts towards the achievement of that goal.

When it comes to language education, two inextricably embedded realities shape professional goals and identities are societal attitudes towards languages at large and ownership of a language and culture by particular groups. These two aspects of our daily endeavors as language teachers and educators are all too often obviated or taken for granted. In particular, the foreign language (FL) teaching profession has traditionally assumed an understanding of language and education premised on the alleged neutrality of FLs regarding the relative power and status of languages within the larger society. This may be partly because, in contrast with English as a Second Language (ESL) and Bilingual Education (BE) teachers, who are concerned with the language education needs of minority students (e.g., Ovando & Collier, 1985), FL teachers have traditionally associated themselves with the educational needs of native English-speaking students. This apolitical stance can only be understood through a critical appraisal of the history of the FL profession. Its negative consequences for minority language education are far reaching but seldom examined in FL mainstream scholarly and professional discussions. Furthermore, the lack of political awareness also harms the FL profession itself, in that the linguistic and cultural resources that minority students bring to educational settings remain untapped in most FL programs.

This chapter will review the main areas of conflict between the mainstream ethos of the FL profession and the goals of multilingualism and language equality for minority language students. It is argued that critical changes within the field of foreign language education can only begin to happen if teachers, educators, and scholars acknowledge and act upon the political dimensions of language education.

Ortega, L. (1999). Rethinking foreign language education: Political dimensions of the ·ssion. In K. A. Davis (Ed.), *Foreign language teaching and language minority education.* ·hnical Report #19, pp. 21–39). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language hing and Curriculum Center.

THE NEED FOR A POLITICAL VIEW ON LANGUAGE EDUCATION

POLITICS AND THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFESSION

The dismissal of the political nature of second language teaching within the FL profession is one of the biggest problems when attempting to formulate changes to serve the (foreign) language education needs of minority students. For instance, McKay and Wong (1988) surveyed journal articles from 1974 to 1987 which appeared in one TESOL and two FL major journals (*TESOL Quarterly*, *The Modern Language Journal*, and *Foreign Language Annals*) and found that sociopolitical awareness and professional topics were the least reflected in all three professional journals. FL scholarly writing appears to be unconcerned with issues of changing language attitudes, government language policy, the relationship between the profession and the community, and political action on language-related events and issues to be taken by language professional organizations.

Similarly, in her nation-wide survey of 1,136 high school, college, and university FL teachers, Lamb (1994) found that many FL professionals declared having limited interaction with the ESL and BE professions in terms of networking, teaching, and research. They tended to consider FL as apolitical and impartial regarding issues of language education, bilingual education, and language policy and, in fact, "appeared no better informed about bilingual education than the general public" (Lamb, 1994, p. 183). FL teachers often believed FL programs to be neutral and to exist as academic subjects independently of potential official English policies and of the funding processes affecting ESL or BE (Lamb, 1994, p. 130).

Those within FL education who view multilingualism as a true resource for every individual and for society at large explicitly reject the widely held conviction that foreign language teaching, unlike other second language teaching, can be politically neutral (see especially Bernhardt & Hammadou, 1987; Byrnes, 1992; Lange, 1987; McKay & Wong, 1988; Tedick & Walker, 1994, 1995; Tedick, Walker, Lange, Paige, Jorstad, 1993; Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995). These scholars have urged FL professionals to position themselves politically and to "embrace a broad cultural *context* for language and culture learning that assumes that all students can develop both linguistic and cultural literacy beyond that of their first language and primary culture" (Tedick et al., 1993, p. 58; emphasis in the original). These voices attest to an unprecedented disposition in the FL education literature to acknowledge the sociopolitical and ideological nature of language education and to bridge the fields of FL education and minority language education (e.g., Byrnes, 1992; Kramsch, 1995; Padilla, Fairchild, & Valadez, 1990; Tedick & Walker, 1995; Valdés, 1991, 1995; Wilberchied & Dassier, 1995).

The lack of political awareness among FL professionals not only fails the needs and goals of multilingualism and multiculturalism among minority students, but it also harms the FL profession itself, in that the linguistic and cultural resources that minority students bring to educational settings remain untapped in most FL

programs. Yet, these bilingual resources can play an important role in the improvement of FL instruction through explicit curricular connections between the FL classroom and community resources, as the programmatic five Cs (*communication*, *cultures*, *connections*, *comparisons*, *and communities*) of the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning, established in 1995, reflect (see Lafayatte, 1996; for examples of curricular implementation, see Overfield, 1997). From the perspective of SLA theory, the resources of bilingual students may prove crucial for quality foreign language instruction in two other respects. First, conversation partners with higher competence in the L2 are crucial in providing quality opportunities for pushed output which are thought to facilitate and maximize language development (M. H. Long, 1996; Swain, 1995; Yule, Powers, & Macdonald, 1992). In addition, integrative motivation and valued instrumentality (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Wen, 1997) are powerful predictors of FL achievement, and the connections between FL learning and US-based communities of speakers of the target language can only make the foreign language more immediate and relevant to majority English-speaking students in FL classrooms.

Nevertheless, the belief systems of FL teachers and educators, as well as professional legitimization tensions within FL institutions, continue to perpetuate elitist views of foreign language education as the restricted realm of the elite, keeping minority students and minority teachers away from the FL profession. Without an explicit understanding of context and the politics of teaching languages, teachers are left without tools to resist hegemonic practices in language education that discriminate against minority language students.

ARE FOREIGN LANGUAGES A RESOURCE FOR ALL?

Three societal and institutional orientations towards language diversity have been identified by Ruiz (1988): language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource. *Language-as-problem* manifests itself in conventional wisdom which connects non-English language heritage and circumstantial bilingualism with social problems, and which has its most threatening articulation in English-Only sentiments that call for official English policies. The *language-as-right* orientation, on the other hand, capitalizes on the natural and legal right for minority groups to fight discrimination on the basis of language and finds its strongest articulation in advocacy for bilingual education. Finally, *language-as-resource* acknowledges the value of knowledge of and competence in languages in the social, educational, and economic spheres of our modern, multicultural world. The educational reform movements of the mid–1980s and beginning of the 1990s seemed to adopt this latter approach and called for changes in language education to address national needs for a bilingual work force for international business purposes (e.g., the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986; the Holmes Group, 1986, 1990; the National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; and the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies, 1979).

What is the position of the FL profession given these three possible orientations toward language? FL education would seem to be typically associated with a

language-as-resource perspective, in that it traditionally provides for multilingual training for diplomatic, military, business, and educational needs in the United States. However, as voices from the fields of sociolinguistics and language planning (e.g., Fishman, 1966; Lambert, 1987; Tucker, 1984, 1990) have strongly argued, efforts to address national economic needs for a bilingual work force are cost- and time-inefficient when they concentrate on developing second language competence in monolingual English speakers, while the enormous language resources of the growing ethnic non-English populations in the country are wasted. In other words, foreign language education can no longer confine itself to serving majority English speakers, but needs to be responsive to the language education needs of (circumstantial) bilingual students, in order to respond to the alleged market demands of the US. Indeed, the rapid changes in the makeup of language classrooms in urban settings in most parts of the world confront language educators with serious challenges, as changing patterns of language use and social identity complicate old definitions of 'bilingualism' (cf. Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997).

Unfortunately, there is ample evidence that FL education is structured in ways so as to reproduce the pervasive societal belief that second languages are a resource available for mainstream monolingual speakers only. Different expectations for majority and minority language students perpetuate "a view of 'foreign language study' for majority language students as an elite endeavor" (Tedick & Walker, 1995, p. 302). Bluntly put, monolingual native speakers of English are encouraged to study a foreign language during adolescence but are not expected to develop proficiency in it for actual use, whereas minority students are compelled to develop native-like academic proficiency in the majority language in very limited periods of time and often at the expense of their first language development (Dicker, 1996). Thus, the liberal rhetoric of language-as-resource for the 21st century perpetuates the entrenched myth of foreign language learning as an elite endeavor: mastery of a second language is presented as desirable cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1982) to equip majority English speakers for the challenges of a competitive job market, while the bilingualism of minority speakers is treated as a hindrance to academic and socioeconomic success, or as an unnecessary and unrealistic effort in a caste-regulated distribution of jobs in the corporate economy (Ogbu, 1988).

In addition to the problem of different standards for majority and minority language students, few minority language students choose foreign language teaching as a career (Lange, 1991; Valdés, 1992, 1995; Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995). The reasons for the alarming under-representation of minority teachers in FL departments can be traced back to hegemonic notions of nativeness and standardness which perpetuate gatekeeping practices against minority students. The teaching force in most university FL departments comprises majority non-native speakers who attained near native-like competence through extended formal instruction and study abroad experiences on the one hand, and native speakers who acquired the target language in the course of primary socialization and are hired as international teaching assistants on the other. Both groups present the alleged advantage of having high proficiency in a standard variety of the L2 and a mastery of literature and grammar (Valdés, 1995), and both types of teachers embody the

ideal target of the "monolingual speaker" — even though they are, strictly speaking, bilingual.

The extent of this gatekeeping problem cannot be neglected, since it reinforces the cycle of exclusion and elitism: as has been amply documented, mainstream teachers are inadequately prepared to provide academic support for minority students (e.g., Davis & Golden, 1994; Nieto, 1992; Valdés, 1995) and minority teachers are crucial in providing role models for minority student populations (e.g., Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1991). Although the need for role models in minority education has been recognized in the teacher education literature (Chinn & Wong, 1992; Dilworth, 1990; Irvine, 1992; King, 1993), very little is done at an institutional or practical level to remedy the situation in the realm of FL education (Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995).

SOURCES OF HEGEMONIC BELIEFS IN FL EDUCATION

In the preceding discussion I have argued that there is an elitist double standard prevalent in FL education: bilingualism in a foreign language is encouraged for monolingual English speakers and is presented as a resource for developing economic prowess, while the bilingualism of immigrants and indigenous groups is perceived and confronted as a problem. These beliefs and attitudes remain unproblematized because of the misguided conviction that FL teaching is apolitical, and they effectively serve to stigmatize language minority students in many FL classrooms, or to keep them away from pursuing advanced study in a foreign language.

Such gatekeeping mechanisms need to be understood in the context of structural constraints of the FL profession, since the specifics of the different institutional settings in which prospective teachers are socialized and where languages are taught and learned profoundly affect the realities of the FL profession. Consequently, the remainder of the chapter will discuss how power struggles and professional legitimization efforts within academia and in the wider society have strongly influenced the FL professional and epistemological agendas chosen since the mid eighties. I will build the argument around four areas: teacher credentialism, the language proficiency movement, the paralyzing focus on methods, and the myth of the "native speaker." These four pillars of FL professional and scholarly cultures constitute a legacy that, in many ways, has kept broader sociopolitical considerations outside the realm of FL education, with the consequence that minority language students' concerns have been neglected. As a result, the FL profession has failed to provide minority language students as well as English-speaking majority students with optimal opportunities for academic achievement.

STRUCTURAL CONSTRAINTS IN FL INSTITUTIONS

Some scholars have argued that "second language contexts share more similarities than differences and that the time is ripe for language teachers as well as language

educators in these fields to join efforts" (Tedick & Walker, 1994, p. 303). However, the historical, ideological, and structural differences that permeate the second language (SL) professions and the respective communities of teachers and scholars cannot be underestimated (Ortega, in press). It may well be a disservice to the goals of a politically responsible language education to ignore the specificity of different institutional settings in which languages are taught and learned.

University language departments, in which foreign language teachers are typically forged, focus almost exclusively on the teaching of literature and on literary criticism. Within these departments, a tension has always existed between literature (and sometimes theoretical linguistics) scholarship as a legitimate form of academic knowledge on the one hand, and language teaching and applied linguistic research on the other. These latter areas of scholarship are viewed as 'non-tenurable specialt[ies]' (Di Pietro, Lantolf, & Labarca, 1983; also Teschner, 1987). This tension has had a negative impact on egalitarian language education in at least three respects.

First, the tension perpetuates the historical view of the study of foreign languages as ancillary to the reading of the 'classics' (Rivers, 1983) and heavily contributes to a traditional conception of learning that is Eurocentric and bookish and is sustained by a lecture-based pedagogy (see Shor, 1986). This philosophy of language teaching and learning not only engenders elitist attitudes towards language minority students, but it is also particularly ill-suited to prepare FL teachers for serving those language minority students in FL classrooms. Second, this structural tension plays a major role in the failure of FL departments to develop language competent students and teachers (e.g., Di Pietro, Lantolf, & Labarca, 1983; Lafayette, 1993; Valette, 1991). This failure was denounced in the educational reform literature and has been since then bitterly addressed by the FL profession (e.g., see discussion in Schrier, 1993), with a tendency for solutions that capitalize on excellence and professionalism to the exclusion of language equality concerns. The resolution of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages in 1995 to set national standards for the FL profession was directed towards long-term solutions to the problem of underachievement in functional FL competence (Lafayette, 1996).

Third and finally, conflicts of professional legitimization and status attainment within FL university departments have promoted an inward approach to the problems of the FL profession, preventing FL teachers and scholars from establishing the basis for dialogue within broader educational and political perspectives and keeping FL teacher preparation programs entrenched into language "camps" (Tedick & Walker, 1995). Because FL scholars have always needed to vindicate their professional status within language departments and to legitimate language teaching as a discipline in the wider university system, they have sought to associate themselves with legitimate sources within academic research traditions, namely psychology and linguistics. Thus, the tendency has been to ignore the sociopolitical dimensions of learning and the sociocultural context of education, which are the center of academic inquiry in colleges and departments of education.

SOME PITFALLS OF PROFESSIONALISM

Individuals, associations, and institutions in FL education seem for the most part to have ignored structural and political constraints that make it impossible to gain professional monopoly and autonomy over FL teaching education in the country on the sole basis of teacher education improvement and a push for professionalization (see Labaree, 1995; and Murray, 1992, for analyses of the fundamental problems of basing professionalization and status attainment struggles on the models of high status professions such as medicine and law). In spite of increasing efforts for professionalism in second and foreign language education (Crookes, 1997), it is still difficult to convince both the general public and the university hierarchy in more traditional disciplines (e.g., linguistics and literature departments) that language teaching is a form of exclusive professional expertise. Two examples of conventional wisdom need to be dispelled: that native or near-native proficiency is sufficient qualification to teach a language, and that the most efficient way of learning a second language as an adult is by immersion in the target-language community. The former belief questions the need for a language teacher career, while the latter questions the necessity and benefits of FL formal instruction.

In light of these professional struggles, changes in language education initiated in the early 1980s responded to two professional issues of great importance at that time: the need to ensure near-native language competence among second language teachers and students, and the need to establish a knowledge base for the teaching and learning of second languages that sets the basis for effective L2 classroom techniques. The solutions offered, however, amply failed to contemplate considerations of language equality and the impact of the new professional agenda on minority students. Indeed, it is a fair assessment to contend that the nature of the solutions for enhanced quality of FL instruction and legitimized professional status have often been sought without a consideration of broader negative sociopolitical consequences, such as the reinforcement of gatekeeping mechanisms that have to date left minority groups out of the FL teaching profession. Indeed, the linguistic and cultural resources of minority language students have been untapped in most FL professional initiatives.

TEACHER CREDENTIALISM

The concern to ensure high degrees of linguistic and cultural competence among FL teachers has led to the implementation of standardized proficiency tests as part of teacher credentialing mechanisms in many states. Some FL teacher educators have gone as far as to suggest that, if feasible, mandatory study abroad experiences should be included in standard teacher preparation programs (Lafayette, 1993). These professional initiatives, however, overlook research that shows how the use of teacher entry and competency exams disproportionately affects minority students (Dilworth, 1990; King, 1993), and how study abroad and traveling are beyond the reasonable scope of prospective FL minority students and teachers, since abroad exchanges are often seen as a prohibitive investment of time and money (Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995). Only recently has community-based learning

begun to be considered a worthy alternative in providing FL learners with first-hand exposure to language input (D. R. Long, 1997; Overfield, 1997).

On the other hand, there has been a sense of marginalization of FL professional associations from the federal and state government processes of accreditation of FL programs and certification of teachers. Namely, FL teacher associations acknowledge the fact that their professional initiatives, though influential, have no authority over federal and state decision-making policies for teacher accreditation and certification (Lafayette, 1993). For instance, Rhodes and Oxford (1988) report that most FL teachers in the elementary school (FLES) programs lacked certification to teach FLs, and Schrier (1993) notes that a double standard in the provision of certification by state departments of education allows emergency licensing to native speakers, who are accredited to teach some languages in some states with no language-teaching preparation. This is particularly the case with the so-called 'truly foreign languages' (Jorden & Walton, 1989) or less commonly taught languages (LCTLs).

THE PROFICIENCY MOVEMENT

Under the same thrust for teaching excellence and professionalism stands the development of the "proficiency movement" in the world of SL education (Bachman & Savignon, 1986). Although many in the FL profession posited positive washback effects of the proficiency-based tests on teacher competency, curriculum design, and methods (e.g., Higgs, 1982; Omaggio, 1983; Schulz, 1988), the proficiency movement has also reinforced pervasive attitudes of linguistic elitism and minimal awareness of the sociopolitical dimensions of language teaching.

For one, the proficiency literature has persistently ignored the criticisms of scholars who pointed out the inadequacy of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines to measure the language ability of circumstantial bilinguals (Valdés, 1989; see also Valdés & Figueroa, 1994), the biased notions of standardness and nativeness underlying the Guidelines (e.g., Marisi, 1994) and the fact that an overemphasis on language proficiency and communicative competence often diverts due attention from the real language needs of minority students and hinders the recognition of their potential as resources in FL education.

More subtly, practices in FL classrooms that connect the attainment of language proficiency and communicative competence with making a rule of the use of the target-language only in the L2 classroom abound, banning connections between first and second language development in FL instruction. Missing these connections amounts to indifference towards the maintenance of the L1 in an English-dominant society, to linguicism (Nieto, 1992) in the FL classroom against FL minority students who are speakers of a non-standard variety of the target language or of English, and to inadequacy in dealing with heterogeneous language proficiencies and functional literacies (in the L1 and/or in English) in the FL classroom.

Similarly, the communicative goal of exposing students to 'authentic' discourse is overwhelmingly understood as promoting the use of authentic materials produced *by* native speakers *for* native speakers of the language *in* the target culture, always portrayed as an existing standard in a foreign country outside the States. In spite of the fact that there are numerous speech communities of the so-called foreign language within the States, to which minority students in the FL classroom may belong, these are ignored in materials, syllabi, and classroom discussions.

These nested pedagogical practices and attitudes inspired by the goal of proficiency and communicative language competence have reinforced and exacerbated the situation of insularity of the FL classroom and its orientation towards the ideal of the monolingual speaker in a far foreign country. As Tedick et al. (1993, p. 57) put it, "the study of second languages is largely decontextualized, unrelated to students' real life within their school, community, family, and peer groups."

THE CHOICE OF A KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR THE PROFESSION: ABOUT METHODS

Decontextualizing second language education from the larger sociocultural and political realities in which it is embedded has a long tradition (see Crookes, 1997) and has led to the proliferation of formulas for theory, inquiry, and praxis that are supposedly valid for all teachers, with all students, in all settings, and for all second languages taught irrespective of societal language status and power conflicts with English, the majority language (see Barnhardt, 1994, for a similar criticism). The overwhelming focus on language-specific, 'one-size-fits-all' (Kubota, 1998) methods, at least for some sectors of the FL profession, seems to respond to the perceived need of teachers to operate with usable, practical knowledge that is readily applicable to teaching (Labaree, 1992). It also reflects in part the professional will to proclaim a content knowledge base which is specific to and exclusive of second language teaching (e.g., Bernhardt & Hammadou, 1987; Jarvis, 1983; Lafayette, 1993; Lange, 1983; Wing, 1993).

Extensive research on culturally responsive pedagogies attests to the structural, institutional, and sociocultural incongruencies that result from methods-based, decontextualized approaches to teaching and teacher education (e.g., Barnhardt, 1994; Cazden, 1988; Davis, 1995; Delpit, 1988; Holliday, 1994; Kubota, 1998; Kuo, 1995; McDermott, 1982; Weinstein, 1984; Willet, 1995). Critical voices in the wider field of education have repeatedly claimed that a myopic focus on methodology often diverts attention away from examining the sociohistorical and political dimensions of education and mask the process of unconscious reproduction of unequal societal power relationships in the classroom (Bartolome, 1994; Bredo, Henry, & McDermott, 1990; Britzman, 1986).

Although a few FL scholars have directly addressed the problem of what has been called "the paralyzing focus on methodology" in the FL education profession (McKay & Wong, 1988; Tedick & Walker, 1994; Tedick et al., 1993), there is a conspicuous silence in the literature regarding the implications of such an

overwhelming focus in questions of political responsibility of individual language teachers and of the profession as a whole (however, in the ESL profession there are critical appraisals of this problem; see Auerbach, 1986; Auerbach & Burgess, 1985; and see Faltis, 1990; and Graman, 1988; in the realm of FL). There has been a gradually increasing recognition of the pitfalls of equating a single 'methods' course with foreign language teaching education for over a decade now (e.g., Bernhardt and Hammadou, 1987) and the tendency in recent years has been one of acknowledging the need for language teacher educators to address *teacher development* rather than 'teacher training' or 'teacher preparation,' and to talk about *pedagogical content knowledge* rather than 'methodology courses' as the core components of FL teacher education (e.g., most contributions in Alatis, Stern, & Strevens, 1983; Lange, 1990; Richards & Nunan, 1990). The change of terminology, however, constitutes little more than an example of lip service to more general trends in the teacher education literature, and most of these proposals persist with the paralyzing emphasis on pedagogical methods.

THE MYTH OF "THE NATIVE SPEAKER" AND LINGUICISM IN FL PROFESSIONAL CULTURES

In the mainstream FL professional culture of teachers, as well as in society at large, primary socialization (child L1 acquisition in a monolingual setting) and immersion in the target culture as an adult (adult L2 acquisition in the monolingual setting of the target society) seem to be the privileged paths to attainment of near-native competence (see Ferguson & Huebner, 1991; Valdés, 1995; Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995). Furthermore, the FL traditional definition of multiculturalism seems to encompass only cultures outside of the United States. As a result, FL teachers give students the ambivalent message that certain kinds of naturalistic learning are superior not only to formal instruction (Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995), but also to naturalistic acquisition in community contexts within the States. For instance, all FL programs in higher education place a great emphasis on study abroad experiences (e.g., DeKeyser, 1990; Freed, 1995; Nash, 1976; Pyle, 1981), and FL textbooks overwhelmingly concern themselves with the portrayal of mainstream cultural values of the countries where the target-language is spoken, with no reference to US speech communities (see Moore, 1991; cited in Tedick et al., 1993; Ramírez & Hall, 1990).

Due to the traditional focus on English monolingual students, FL research and FL pedagogy have naturally failed to link language and literacy development of the second language to that of the first language (Tedick & Walker, 1995), since this is not an issue for majority monolingual speakers. As a consequence, FL teachers typically remain unaware of or uninterested in L1 maintenance. Yet, understanding relationships between first and second language literacy and proficiency development would be essential when addressing the needs of circumstantial bilinguals (see Cummins, 1991, 1992; Valdés, 1992), and ignorance of such issues often leads to linguicism, or the prejudice against non-standard varieties of the target-language (Nieto, 1992) commonly displayed in FL classrooms. Namely, because of lack of knowledge of sociolinguistics and second dialect and second

language learning, FL teachers often insist upon "standardness" of either the L1 or the L2 of the minority student and may even label the non-mainstream student as an 'inadequate' language learner (Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995). In many cases, FL teachers may take certain non-standard language forms used by bilingual students in the class as non-native-like, rather than belonging to the non-standard native variety of the students. On such occasions, it is not unusual for FL teachers not to be able to recognize certain forms as systematic features of a particular variety of the language, and to conclude, mistakenly, that a student has 'fossilized' altogether.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter examined the main areas of conflict between the mainstream ethos of the FL profession and the goals of multilingualism and language equality for minority language students. It was argued that the entrenched belief that foreign language education can be apolitical and neutral has prevented FL teachers from critically examining their responsibility in the advancement of multilingualism in educational settings and in the society at large. There is an elitist double standard prevalent in FL education: bilingualism in a foreign language is encouraged among monolingual English speakers and is presented as an economic resource, while the bilingualism of immigrants and indigenous groups is perceived and confronted as a problem. This elitism is not questioned because of the belief that the language education of minority students need not be the concern of the foreign language profession. In actuality, such attitudes and beliefs serve as gatekeepers for language minority students in many FL classrooms and harm the FL profession in the long term by precluding a recognition of the potential resources that bilingual students bring into the classroom. Language minority students can not only provide English-speaking majority students with optimal opportunities for language interaction that are believed to facilitate L2 development (M. H. Long, 1996; Swain, 1995), but they also bring into the FL classroom cultural and linguistic bridges to communities in the States. These bridges are likely to constitute a force for integrative and instrumental motivation, making foreign language learning more relevant and immediate for English-speaking students and increasing chances of high levels of FL achievement (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). In sum, realizing the potential of minority students' contribution to a notion of foreign languages *as a resource for all* can lead to the improvement of FL instruction and greater involvement in foreign language study among English-speaking as well as minority language-speaking students in the US (e.g., Sung & Padilla, 1998).

Power struggles and professional legitimization efforts within academia and in the wider society have strongly influenced the FL professional and epistemological agendas since the mid eighties. Teacher credentialism, a focus on language proficiency, the search for a defined knowledge base for FL teaching and learning, and the myth of a "native speaker" as the ideal target of FL education constitute the most pervasive legacy of the last two decades. This legacy has had negative sociopolitical consequences for the increasing minority student populations in schools and universities. In the search for professional legitimization, FL teaching

education has often become a matter of method-based, context-free solutions, while the profession as a whole has failed to enter into an examination of the complex interconnections between language, literacy, and cultural development of students in their first and second language, and how methods interact with the social context of learning and the political and educational goals of individuals and institutions.

What can be done to aid FL teachers and educators in their increasing efforts to respond to the needs and goals of circumstantial bilinguals in L2 classrooms? Some proposals in the FL profession envision a future perspective of a "common corps of second language professionals" joined in the process of reconceptualizing the FL profession and changing language teaching practices to encourage bilingualism and multiculturalism in the citizenry (Lange, 1987; McKay & Wong, 1988; Tedick & Walker, 1995). Other perhaps more realistic frameworks concentrate on the specialization among language teaching professional bodies in distinct areas of expertise. Thus, Valdés (1992) suggests that the FL profession be tracked into a FL teaching division, devoted to the teaching of second languages to majority students who are monolingual speakers of English, and a language maintenance division that concerns itself with the needs of minority students who are circumstantial bilinguals and enter SL education with a wide range of proficiency in their first language. In serving the needs of minority language students in FL classrooms, Valdés argues for the need to develop a specific body of research in pedagogy for and assessment of circumstantial bilingualism (see Valdés, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1995).

Whether changes come from specialization of FL professionals into tracks or from an overall and pervasive sensitization toward the political responsibilities of language education, the FL profession as a whole will need to avail itself of appropriate tools to face the unprecedented challenges that language classrooms in most parts of the world pose today (Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997). The description of FL professional realities entails several layers at the macro-level: the differing degrees of power and status that a particular second language has with respect to the societal or majority language (ideological and sociopolitical aspects); the specificity of different institutional settings in which languages are taught and learned (institutional and structural aspects); and the cultural and linguistic membership of teachers and students within a class (cultural identity aspects). FL teacher education programs and FL scholarly discussions will need to address these three dimensions of professional engagement if future communities of FL teachers are to be prepared to serve the needs of minority students and to fulfill the commitment to language equality in education.

Since the system of beliefs and values of individuals is extremely resistant to substantive change, top down approaches to changes in curriculum are likely to leave teachers' cultures untouched (see Davis, 1995). Models of collaboration among various second language communities of teachers and students within different educational settings seem to be successful in creating conditions that may lead to radical changes among the individuals and institutions involved. In these models, university FL or less commonly taught language departments work in conjunction with high schools to bring together minority and majority language

students in projects that focus on language-as-resource and on improved second language instruction (e.g., Huebner, Bartolome, Avelar-Lasalle, & Azevedo, 1989; the Partnership Project in this volume). The strength of these efforts resides in the uniqueness of capitalizing on the neglected language resources of minority students while promoting interaction between educational settings that remain otherwise isolated from each other.

REFERENCES

Alatis, J. E., Stern, H. H., & Strevens, P. (Eds.). (1983). *Applied linguistics and the preparation of second language teachers: Toward a rationale. GURT '83.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Auerbach, E. (1986). Competency-based ESL: One step forward or two steps back? *TESOL Quarterly, 14,* 221–231.

Auerbach, E., & Burgess, D. (1985). The hidden curriculum of survival ESL. *TESOL Quarterly, 19,* 475–495.

Bachman, L. F., & Savignon, S. J. (1986). The evaluation of communicative language proficiency: A critique of the ACTFL Oral Interview. *The Modern Language Journal, 70,* 380–390.

Barnhardt, C. (1994). Life on the other side: Native student survival in a university world. *Peabody Journal of Education,* 69, 115–139.

Bartolome, L. I. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review,* 64, 173–194.

Bernhardt, C., & Hammadou, J. (1987). A decade of research in foreign language teacher education. *The Modern Language Journal, 71,* 289–299.

Bourdieu, P. (1982). The school as a conservative force: Scholastic and cultural inequalities. In E. Bredo & W. Feinberg (Eds.), *Knowledge and social values in social and educational research* (pp. 391–407). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bredo, E., Henry, M., & McDermott, R. P. (1990). The cultural organization of teaching and learning. Book review of classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning, by C. B. Cazden. *Harvard Educational Review,* 60, 247–258.

Britzman, D. P. (1986). Cultural myths in the making of a teacher: Biography and social structure in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review,* 56, 442–456.

Byrnes, H. (Ed.). (1992). *Languages for a multicultural world in transition. Northeast Conference reports.* Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century.* Washington, DC: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Chinn, P. C., & Wong, G. Y. (1992). Recruiting and retaining Asian/Pacific American teachers. In M. E. Dilworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education: New expectations* (pp. 112–133). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crookes, G. (1997). What influences what and how second and foreign language teachers teach? *The Modern Language Journal, 81*, 67–79.

Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning, 41*, 469–512.

Cummins, J. (1991). Interdependence of first and second language proficiency in bilingual children. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 70–89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (1992). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*, 18–36.

Davis, K. A. (1995). Multicultural classrooms and cultural communities of teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 10*(2), 1–11.

Davis, K. A., & Golden, J. M. (1994). Teacher culture and children's voices in an urban kindergarten center. *Linguistics and education, 6*, 261–287.

DeKeyser, R. M. (1990). Foreign language development during a semester abroad. *University of Pittsburgh Working Papers in Linguistics, 1*, 1–16.

Delpit, L. D. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*, 483–502.

Di Pietro, R. J., Lantolf, J. P., & Labarca, A. (1983). The graduate foreign language curriculum. *The Modern Language Journal, 67*, 365–373.

Dicker, S. J. (1996). *Languages in America: A pluralist view.* Clevendon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Dilworth, M. E. (1990). *Reading between the lines: teachers and their racial/ethnic cultures: Teacher education monograph no. 11* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 332 148 No. SP 032–648). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Faltis, C. (1990). Spanish for native speakers: Freirian and Vygotskian perspectives. *Foreign Language Annals, 23*, 117–126.

Ferguson, C. A., & Huebner, T. (1991). Foreign language instruction and second language acquisition research in the United States. In K. de Boot, R. B. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 3–19). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fishman, J. A. (1966). *Language loyalty in the United States.* The Hague: Mouton.

Freed, B. F. (Ed.). (1995). *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context.* Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Graman, T. (1988). Education for humanization: Applying Paulo Freire's pedagogy to learning a second language. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*, 433–448.

Higgs, T. (1982). What can I do to help? In T. Higgs (Ed.), *Curriculum competence and the foreign language teacher* (pp. 16–30). Skokie, IL: National Textbook.

Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers.* East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools.* East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Huebner, T., Bartolome, L., Avelar-Lasalle, R., & Azevedo, M. (1989). Integrating language education, teacher training, and university-school collaboration: A pilot project. *The Modern Language Journal, 73,* 23–31.

Irvine, J. J. (1992). Making teacher education culturally responsive. In M. E. Dilworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education: New expectations* (pp. 79–92). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jarvis, G. A. (1983). The psychology of second-language learning: A declaration of independence. *The Modern Language Journal, 67,* 393–402.

King, S. H. (1993). The limited presence of African-American teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 63,* 115–149.

Kramsch, C. (Ed.). (1995). *Redefining the boundaries of language study.* Boston: Heinle.

Kubota, R. (1998). Voices from the margin: Second and foreign language teaching approaches from minority perspectives. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 54,* 394–412.

Kuo, H.-J. (1995) *The (in)appropriateness and (in)effectiveness of imparting communicative language teaching to Taiwan.* Unpublished scholarly paper. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Labaree, D. F. (1992). Power, knowledge, and the rationalization of teaching: A genealogy of the movement to professionalize teaching. *Harvard Educational Review, 62,* 123–154.

Labaree, D. F. (1995). The lowly status of teacher education in the United States: The impact of markets and the implications for reform. In N. K. Shimara & I. Z. Holowinsky (Eds.), *Teacher education in industrialized nations. Issues in changing social contexts* (pp. 41–85). New York: Garland Publishing.

Lafayette, R. C. (1993). Subject matter content: What every foreign language teacher needs to know. In G. Guntermann (Ed.), *Developing language teachers for a changing world* (pp. 124–158). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Lafayette, R. (Ed.). (1996). *National Standards: A catalyst for reform.* Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Lamb, S. (1994) *Official English and the foreign language teaching profession.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Delaware.

Lambert, R. D. (1987). The improvement of foreign language competency in the United States. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 490,* 9–19.

Lange, D. L. (1983). Teacher development and certification in foreign languages: Where is the future? *The Modern Language Journal, 67*, 374–381.

Lange, D. L. (1987). The nature and direction of recent proposals and recommendations for foreign language education: A response. *The Modern Language Journal, 71*, 240–249.

Lange, D. L. (1990). A blueprint for a teacher development program. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 245–268). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lange, D. L. (1991). Implications of recent reports on teacher education reform for departments of foreign languages and literatures. *ADFL Bulletin, 23*(1), 28–34.

Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 543–560.

Long, D. R. (1997). The experiential course: An alternative to study abroad for nontraditional students. *Foreign Language Annals, 30*, 301–310.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic Press.

Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1991). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. *Harvard Educational Review, 60*, 315–340.

Marisi, P. (1994). Questions of regionalism in native speaker OPI performance: The French-Canadian experience. *Foreign Language Annals, 27*, 506–521.

McDermott, R. (1982). Social relations as contexts for learning in school. In E. Bredo & W. Feinberg (Eds.), *Knowledge and values in social and educational* (pp. 252–269). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

McKay, S. L., & Wong, S.-L. C. (1988). Language teaching in nativist times: A need for sociopolitical awareness. *The Modern Language Journal, 72*, 379–388.

Moore, J. M. (1991) *An analysis of the cultural content of post-secondary textbooks for Spanish: Evidence of information processing strategies and types of learning in reading selections and post-reading adjunct questions*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Murray, C. E. (1992). Teaching as a profession: The Rochester case in historical perspective. *Harvard Educational Review, 62*, 494–518.

Nash, D. (1976). The personal consequences of a year of study abroad. *Journal of Higher Education, 47*, 191–203.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Longman.

Ogbu, J. (1988). Class stratification, racial stratification, and schooling. In L. Weis (Ed.), *Class, race, and gender in American education* (pp. 163–182). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Omaggio, A. C. (1983). Methodology in transition: The new focus on proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal, 67*, 330–341.

Ortega, L. (in press). Language and equality: ideological and structural constraints in foreign language education in the US. In T. Huebner & K. Davis (Eds.), *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the U.S.A.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ovando, C. J., & Collier, J. P. (Eds.). (1985). *Bilingual education and ESL classrooms.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Overfield, D. M. (1997). From the margins to the mainstream: Foreign language education and community-based learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 30*, 485–491.

Padilla, A. M., Fairchild, H. H., & Valadez, C. M. (Eds.). (1990). *Foreign language education: Issues and strategies.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pyle, K. R. (1981). International cross-cultural service and learning: Impact on student development. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 22*, 506–514.

Ramírez, A. G., & Hall, J. K. (1990). Language and culture in secondary level Spanish textbooks. *The Modern Language Journal, 74*, 48–65.

Rhodes, N. C., & Oxford, R. L. (1988). *A national profile of foreign language instruction at the elementary and secondary school levels* (Technical Report # 6). Los Angeles: Center for Language Education and Research.

Richards, J. C., & Nunan, D. (Eds.). (1990). *Second language teacher education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, W. M. (1983). Preparing college and university instructors for a lifetime of teaching: A luxury or a necessity? In J. E. Alatis, H. H. Stern, & P. Strevens (Eds.), *Applied linguistics and the preparation of second language teachers: Toward a rationale. GURT '83* (pp. 327–341). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Ruiz, R. (1988). Orientations in language planning. In S. McKay & S.-L. Wong (Eds.), *Language diversity: Problem or resource?* (pp. 3–25). New York: Newbury House.

Schrier, L. L. (1993). Prospects for the professionalization of foreign language teaching. In G. Guntermann (Ed.), *Developing language teachers for a changing world* (pp. 105–123). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Schulz, R. A. (1988). Proficiency-based foreign language requirements: A plan for action. *ADFL Bulletin, 19*, 24–28.

Shor, I. (1986). Equality is excellence: Transforming teacher education and the learning process. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*, 406–426.

Sung, H., & Padilla, A. M. (1998). Student motivation, parental attitudes, and involvement in the learning of Asian languages in elementary and secondary schools. *The Modern Language Journal, 82*, 205–216.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in the study of language* (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tedick, D. J., & Walker, C. L. (1994). Second language teacher education: The problems that plague us. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*, 300–312.

Tedick, D. J., & Walker, C. L. (1995). From theory to practice: How do we prepare teachers for second language classrooms? *Foreign Language Annals, 28*, 499–517.

Tedick, D. J., Walker, C. L., Lange, D. L., Paige, M. R., & Jorstad, H. L. (1993). Second language education in tomorrow's schools. In G. Guntermann (Ed.), *Developing language teachers for a changing world* (pp. 43–75). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Teschner, R. V. (1987). A profile of the specialization and expertise of lower division foreign language program directors in American universities. *The Modern Language Journal, 71*, 28–35.

Tucker, G. R. (1984). Toward the development of a language-competent American society. *International Journal of the Society of Language, 45*, 153–160.

Tucker, G. R. (1990). Second language education. Issues and perspectives. In A. M. Padilla, H. H. Fairchild, & C. M. Valadez (Eds.), *Foreign language education: Issues and strategies* (pp. 13–21). New York: Sage.

Valdés, G. (1989). Teaching Spanish to Hispanic bilinguals: A look at oral proficiency testing and the proficiency movement. *Hispania, 72*, 392–401.

Valdés, G. (1991). Minority and majority members in foreign language departments: Toward the examination of established attitudes and values. *ADFL Bulletin, 22*(3), 10–14.

Valdés, G. (1992). The role of the foreign language teaching profession in maintaining non-English languages in the United States. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Languages for a multicultural world in transition: 1992 Northeast Conference Reports* (pp. 29–71). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Valdés, G. (1995). The teaching of minority languages as academic subjects: Pedagogical and theoretical challenges. *The Modern Language Journal, 79*, 299–328.

Valdés, G., & Figueroa, R. A. (1994). *Bilingualism and testing: A special case of bias*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Valette, R. M. (1991). Proficiency and the prevention of fossilization: An editorial. *The Modern Language Journal, 75*, 325–328.

Weinstein, G. (1984). Literacy and second language acquisition: Issues and perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly, 18*, 471–484.

Wen, X. (1997). Motivation and language learning with students of Chinese. *Foreign Language Annals, 30*, 235–251.

Wilberschied, L., & Dassier, J.-L. P. (1995). Increasing the number of minority FL educators: Local action to meet a national imperative. *The Modern Language Journal, 79*, 1–14.

Willet, J. (1995). Becoming a first grader in a second language: An ethnographic study of second language socialization. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 473–503.

Wing, B. H. (1993). The pedagogical imperative in foreign language teacher education. In G. Guntermann (Ed.), *Developing language teachers for a changing world* (pp. 159–186). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Yule, G., Powers, M., & Macdonald, D. (1992). The variable effects of some task-based learning procedures on L2 communicative effectiveness. *Language Learning, 42*, 449–477.

Zafar Syed
Military Language Institute, United Arab Emirates
Audrey C. Burnett
University of Hawai'i

ACCULTURATION, IDENTITY, AND LANGUAGE: IMPLICATIONS FOR LANGUAGE MINORITY EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

In recent times an ever increasing number of people have either elected to, or have had to, migrate to another land, country, or sociocultural community. The process of moving out of one context and into another (acculturating) can be problematic at best. There has been a considerable amount of research in anthropology, sociology, psychology, and more recently in second language acquisition (SLA)[1] looking at how immigrants acculturate, adapt, and assimilate into their new surroundings (see for example Kim, 1988; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Padilla, 1980 for reviews). Scholars in mainstream (and language) education have also begun to explore issues of identity, language loss, and language maintenance in immigrant student populations. The notion of identity is a central concern both in the process of acculturation and language acquisition/maintenance; a number of studies have highlighted the ongoing struggles of those who are trying to define themselves in their new context (Ghuman, 1991; Henze & Vanett, 1993; Hoffman, 1989; Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1991; Stopes-Roe, & Cochrane, 1990; Wade & Souter, 1992). The manner in which language(s), and language education, mediate this process of identity negotiation can have an impact on how these individuals perceive their cross-cultural adjustment. How immigrant students feel about their evolving identity and the acculturation process they are undergoing can have an immediate consequence on their academic performance and success. This chapter attempts to provide a conceptual framework for the process of acculturation —however one defines it— in light of some of the studies done not only in SLA, but also in the social sciences. It seeks to explore some of the resulting issues having to do with identity and language. In particular, the chapter will focus on (1) the acculturation *process* and *context*, (2) the 'costs' associated with acculturation, *vis-à-*

[1] It was not until the mid–seventies, with the work of Gardner & Lambert, Krashen, and Schumann, that social and psychological factors became a research interest in this field. Scholars in SLA are beginning to draw some connections between the acculturation process and the acquisition of a second language.

Syed, Z., & Burnett, A. C. (1999). Acculturation, identity, and language: Implications for l[illegible]age minority education. In K. A. Davis (Ed.), *Foreign language teaching and language [illegible]rity education*. (Technical Report #19, pp. 41–63). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, [illegible]d Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

vis one's social and cultural identity, and (3) the role bilingual education can play in the acculturation process.

TERMINOLOGY AND APPROACHES

It proves expedient at this point to elucidate the basic terminology and the approaches taken by the various academic fields. The concept of *acculturation* is said to have originated within the discipline of anthropology as early as 1880 (*Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989). Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits (1936, p. 49) in an often quoted passage, defined acculturation as "those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups." This was further developed by the Social Science Research Council, which concluded:

> Acculturation may be defined as culture change that is initiated by the conjunction of two or more autonomous cultural systems. Its dynamics can be seen as the selective adaptation of value systems, the processes of integration and differentiation, the generation of developmental sequences, and the operation of role determinants and personality factors (SSRC, 1954, p. 974).

In second language acquisition, acculturation is broadly defined as, "a process in which changes in the language, culture, and system of values of a group happen through interaction with another group with a different language, culture, and system of value" (Richards, Platt, & Platt, 1992, p. 3). Acculturation, in the social sciences, has generally been defined as a bi-directional process where changes occur within *both* groups in contact.

A related concept is found in the word *assimilation*. Assimilation was used as far back as 1677 with reference to conforming to the country of residence (*Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989). This concept was later defined as "a process of interpenetration and fusion" (*International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 1968), where the immigrants are "absorbed" into, and completely identify with, the host society (Eisenstadt, 1954). Richards, Platt, and Platt (1992, p. 23) define it as a "process in which a group gradually gives up its own language, culture, and system of values and takes on those of another group...through a period of interaction." Assimilation has always been viewed as a unidirectional process.

Integration in this context has been defined as "the maintenance of cultural identity as well as the movement to become an integral part of a larger societal framework" (Berry, 1980, p. 13). In such a case, an individual retains his/her 'cultural identity' while at the same time maintains links with the dominant society. Finally, a cover term, *cross-cultural adaptation* (Kim, 1988), has been suggested to refer to the 'movement' (across cultural boundaries) and 'coping' (with cultural change) of migrants and sojourners. It must be noted that these terms are often misused and/or interchanged.

Kim (1988) provides a good historical and cross-disciplinary overview of the various approaches to cross-cultural adaptation. Researchers in the social sciences have analyzed this process both at the group level and at the individual level (Kim, 1988, p. 12). Anthropological and sociological approaches have viewed the acculturation process as a group phenomenon and focused on culture or on the minority-majority relations, respectively (Kim, 1988, p. 13–16). Individual level analysis has been done by researchers in communication, social psychology, sociolinguistics, and cultural anthropology; their focus has been on "strangers' *psychological reactions* and *social integration* while living in a new environment for varied lengths of time" (emphasis in original; p. 19). Both approaches have vacillated between assimilation and integration as the desired goal for immigrant groups (p. 17–21). In SLA, there is evidence of both group and individual approaches[2] (Stauble, 1978; Schmidt, 1983; Schumann, 1978, 1986; Young and Gardner, 1990). Irrespective of the approach, however, SLA has adopted a unidirectional perspective — where "as individuals become more acculturated, they become more assimilated into the dominant culture" (Young and Gardner, 1990, p. 62).

THE MODELS

Several models have been offered to explain the process of acculturation. This section begins with a summary of Schumann's model and goes on to review other models (in the social sciences) with respect to their critical input in refuting the linear perspective.

SCHUMANN'S MODEL

John Schumann's acculturation model (1978, 1986) is an attempt "to provide a social and psychological perspective on second-language acquisition" (Schumann, 1978, p. 50). Schumann begins with the precept that there are several factors influencing SLA[3]; from these he groups the social and affective factors into a single construct which he calls 'acculturation.' Acculturation is defined as "the social and psychological integration of the learner with the target language (TL) group" (p. 29). This process is further hypothesized to be *the* major causal variable in SLA. Schumann claims that "any learner can be placed on a continuum that ranges from social and psychological distance to social and psychological proximity with speakers of the TL, and that the learner will acquire the second language only to the degree that s/he acculturates" (p. 29). Acculturation thus has a social and an affective constituent.[4] The 'best case scenario' for social and psychological

[2] It is interesting to note that the only model in SLA (Schumann's) is primarily based on his work with a single individual — Alberto. It has been critiqued extensively but still remains as a de facto stance by many in SLA.

[3] Schumann offers a taxonomy which includes: social factors; affective factors; personality factors; cognitive factors; biological factors; aptitude factors; personal factors; input factors; and instructional factors.

[4] Social variables include social dominance, integration strategies, enclosure, cohesiveness, size and congruence of groups, attitude, and intended length of stay. Affective variables include language shock, culture shock, motivation, and ego permeability.

proximity (and SLA) would be when the migrating individual assimilates into the target culture. It must be noted here that Schumann qualifies his model to "second-language acquisition under conditions of immigration or extended sojourn in the TL area" (p. 47), where "learning takes place without instruction" (1986, p. 385). His model does not consider cognitive factors[5] or aptitude; it is also restricted to adults.

There is an indication (albeit somewhat tentative) that acculturation into the target culture and thereby giving up of the native culture enhances success in SLA. Inherent in this schema is the idea that native group norms and values will somehow impede target language acquisition — so much so that native culture support systems are viewed as counterproductive.[6] Also, there is the perception of the target culture as homogeneous and static.

PADILLA'S MODEL

Padilla (1980) offers a more pluralistic model. The emphasis here is on 'cultural awareness' and 'ethnic loyalty.' Cultural awareness refers to an individual's "knowledge of specific cultural material (e.g., language, values, art-history, foods, etc.) of the cultural group of origin and/or the host culture." Ethnic loyalty is meant to identify an individual's "preferences of one cultural orientation over the other" (p. 48). Five determinants of change are identified: language familiarity and usage, cultural heritage, ethnicity, ethnic pride and identity, and inter-ethnic interaction. Many of the assumptions present in Schumann's model can also be cited here. Assimilation into the target culture seemingly serves as the end-goal of acculturative change. The marked difference between the two models, however, is Padilla's recognition of native culture values. Preference for native culture, the value of ethnic loyalty and pride, and the importance of cultural heritage are presented in a 'positive' light. The purpose of the present model is not to account for competency or success but rather "to treat acculturation quantitatively and to categorize individuals into typologies" (p. 50). The model was designed specifically for Mexican-Americans and admittedly is not applicable to other groups and situations.

KIM'S MODEL

Recognizing that acculturation, or cross-cultural adaptation, is not solely a psychological, sociological, or anthropological issue, Kim (1988) details a multidimensional model that appears to draw on the various academic fields. The focus, however, is on communication patterns between and within host and ethnic cultures, and "the changes that take place in individual strangers' [immigrants'] internal conditions" (p. 80). The model considers the interplay between five

---

[5] In the original version of the model under study, Schumann did not consider cognition. In his more recent work (Schumann, 1990) he has acknowledged that "we cannot have a general theory or a complete theory of second language learning without including cognitive processing within its scope" (p. 682).

[6] Ideally individuals who are members of immigrant groups that are less enclosed, less cohesive, and small (in numbers) will be more 'successful.'

constructs: adaptive predisposition, host environmental conditions, personal communication, social communication, and adaptation outcome. Kim claims that her model resolves the conflict between 'assimilationist and pluralistic' positions by simply assuming that adaptation is "neither desirable nor undesirable on the theoretical level, but that it takes place naturally and inevitably" (p. 80). She further claims

> Realistically, an average stranger will not become fully competent in the host communication system to the extent that his or her communication modes are identical with the natives. The individual makes a workable adaptation, nonetheless, as a result of both continuous exposure to the natives and the many trials and errors in interacting with them...In this process, at least some of the original cultural attributes must be unlearned and some of the host cultural attributes acquired. At any given moment, both the original and the new cultural attributes are present in a stranger. (p. 80)

In spite of the somewhat 'primitive' usage of words like "natives" and "stranger," the model merits attention. The bi-directional causality, as represented by the model, is far more representative[7] of the reality of this process than Schumann's model. Cultural and racial factors, and 'intercultural identity' are accounted for. The model is more universal in that it is not limited to particular groups, situations, or ages. There is no full-scale assimilation inherent in this model; in fact, Kim appears to be saying that 'native-like' performance is *not* possible. The model is limited, however, by the fact that it does not explain changes in the host culture. That is to say, the model does not account for how host environmental conditions invariably change with each successive "ethnic culture," and further how these changes impact subsequent encounters.

BERRY'S MODEL

Berry (1980, 1992; Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989) details a model based on two important questions: (a) Is maintaining cultural identity and characteristics considered to be of value? (b) Is maintaining relationships with other groups considered to be of value? The corresponding 'yes' or 'no' answers to these two questions highlight four classification and four acculturation strategies.

Integration implies "the maintenance of the cultural integrity of the group, as well as the movement by the group to become an integral part of a larger societal framework." *Assimilation* is the relinquishing of one's native cultural identity for the larger society. When there are no positive relations with the larger society, and this is accompanied by a maintenance of ethnic identity and tradition, *separation*[8] is said to occur. Finally, marginalization is the choice when there is no cultural or psychological contact with either cultures (Berry et al. 1989, pp. 186–189). Irrespective of the strategy selected, two broad forms of changes are said to take place: *behavioral shifts* and *acculturative stress*. Shifts in behavior result from 'learning'

[7] In Schumann's model it is not clear how (or if) the variables interact.

[8] When separation is instigated by the dominant group this is referred to as *segregation*.

behavior in the new culture and 'shedding' features of original culture. Conflicts between the two cultures and systematically related to the acculturation process are termed acculturative stress. Berry concludes that not only do groups differ in their acculturation choice, but each individual "participates in and experiences acculturation to varying degrees" (Berry, 1992, p. 76). This model is perhaps the most dynamic and broad reaching of those discussed here. It identifies acculturation strategies that bring to bear attitudes towards *both* contexts and focuses on the changes associated with acculturation. It views integration as maintaining native culture in one's private life and adopting the native culture in public domains.

IMPLICATIONS AND ISSUES

Acculturation as simply a linear/unidirectional process (Schumann, 1978, 1986, 1990) does not fully incorporate the dynamics of cross-cultural adaptation (Edwards, 1985). The idea of giving up one's native culture (norms, values, beliefs) in order to assimilate into the target culture decidedly paints the immigrant into a corner with only one option — that of conforming to the norm.[9] Such a model does not account for dual-membership nor recognizes change as bi-directional.[10] In fact, with continued immigration, traditional English-speaking centers (England, USA, Canada, Australia) are no longer as homogeneous as in the past — Hawai'i being the perfect example. As immigrants acculturate, the target group into which they seek membership itself undergoes change. Thus, the host society is transformed by incoming members (Taft, 1953). This 'changed' community may be more tolerant and less threatening to newly arrived immigrants. There is an exponential development here; as more immigrants join a particular society, that society is likely to become increasingly less 'culture specific.' Additionally, this 'multicultural' society may present a context where interaction between the various incoming groups is more prevalent than between each incoming group and the host community. This can also have some influence on the level of acculturation of these new members. The application of bi-directional models (Berry et al. 1989; Kim, 1988) suggests that acculturation (as defined in the social sciences), not assimilation, is the more appropriate term to represent immigrants' adaptation. Furthermore, it is argued that it is possible (and more likely) that immigrants identify to both host and native cultures without this infringing on, or limiting, their participation and competence in the host society (Berry et al. 1989).

This leads to another important issue with respect to the linear model. Inherent in such models is the implication that the culture, language, literacy, and characteristics that individuals bring with them are not of any value. Not only are

---

[9] In the linear process, one is either *in* or *out* of the main frame (mainstream culture). We suppose one could always 'escape' by simply electing to go back to the native country. Unfortunately, this too is not a realistic option for many immigrants.

[10] There is considerable observable evidence that suggests that the host culture does change as a result of immigrant acculturation. One needs only to look at the various 'multicultural societies that have resulted where neighborhoods with names like Chinatown, Little Italy, and the Punjabi Market abound.

these factors not valued, they are in fact hegemonically devalued (Erickson, 1987; Ferdman, 1990; Henze & Vanett, 1993; Hoffman, 1989; Renato, 1985). That is to say, an immigrant's sociocultural upbringing is seen as a hindrance to acculturation and the learning/acquiring of a new language. Such ethnocentric disempowerment of immigrants can place a tremendous amount of pressure on those in the process of cross-cultural adaptation — not only hindering acculturation (Berry, 1980) but also limiting SLA (Gardner, 1985).[11] Additionally, such a perspective is limiting in its scope in that it cannot effectively focus on the acculturation process given its etic approach.

There are several other issues that need to be considered. First, we need to examine the importance of support systems (intragroup and intergroup) and the motivations behind migration. The present immigration process (in North America and Hawai'i) sees most incoming members arriving into a more or less well established 'ethnic' communities. These communities may have their own religious institutions, schools, activity centers, student organizations, network of professionals (doctors, lawyers, barbers, merchants, etc.), and residential enclaves *within* the target community. These communal infrastructures can serve an important role in the adjustment of new comers to the target culture. Kim (1990, p. 207) in talking about Korean immigrants in Canada, for example, concludes that "these institutions may have buffered the effects of stressful acculturation events."[12] Support in this sense is not restricted to the ethnic community; how the host culture views incoming members can go a long way in helping new arrivals acclimatize to their new surroundings (Erickson, 1987; Guy 1989; Murphy, 1975).[13] It is not merely having a positive attitude (as Schumann and others have suggested) that is needed; host communities need to provide programs and services specifically designed to help immigrants in this process. According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984) how individuals cope with the problems and difficulties of acculturation depends (wholly or in part) on the resources available. Also, how well the educational institutes support such individuals,[14] both in terms of educational programs and classroom practices, is instrumental in their developing a positive affective disposition and for their academic success (Lucas, Henze, and Donato, 1991; Willet, 1995).

---

[11] It has been shown that immigrants who live in societies pursuing a policy of multiculturalism had better mental health when compared to immigrants living in societies pursuing an assimilationist policy (Murphy, 1975).

[12] As such, they are not necessarily counter productive to the process of acculturation — if by acculturation we mean adjusting into a new context.

[13] Here we would also list Ogbu's theory of school failure (1987) for involuntary immigrant minority groups. Ogbu argues that because of a history of oppression and racism in the society at large, members of these groups have lost faith in the system and thereby no longer buy into its doctrines. There are many immigrant groups who have been a part of North American history (i.e., the Chinese and Japanese railroad workers in Canada and America) and a part of British history (the East Indians); as such, they have also faced oppression (to varying degrees) over the years. Granted the dynamics are different between the two examples, but these immigrants may also be reacting to some long standing inequalities.

[14] This is crucial. A good number, if not all, of the immigrant will most likely go through some kind of schooling (language education, vocational schools, high school, college/university, etc.).

Secondly, the concept of culture needs to be explored. All of the above mentioned models seem to have a very static view of culture. They appear to be referring to two specific, identifiable, perpetual cultures — a native culture and a host culture. As Henze and Vanett (1993) point out, cultures are always in flux. They are fluid; they are not uniform packages that operate in isolation or present themselves in their entirety at any given point. Also, why only two cultures? There is a growing sense in the literature that our culture is nothing more than "our knowledge and experience" (Kulick, 1994; Wolcott, 1991) and that "no one today is purely *one* [emphasis in original] thing" (Said, 1993, p. 336). Wolcott (1991), in his controversial paper, "Propriospect and the acquisition of culture," questions the viability of acquiring culture by re-introducing Goodenough's (1971) term 'propriospect.'[15] Wolcott, quoting Goodenough, defines propriospect as "the totality of the private, subjective view of the world and its contents that each human develops out of personal experience" (p. 258). According to this 'model,' competence gained in one context does not necessitate competence lost in another — as with languages; "cultures are sets of behaviors in which we engage, not something we join" (Goodenough, 1971, as quoted in Wolcott, p. 263). This is culture, not with a capital 'C,' but rather our own personalized version of culture. Also, by "viewing humans in terms of competencies rather than deficiencies, propriospect directs attention not only to individual potential but also to human accomplishment"[16] (Wolcott, 1991, p. 265).

Finally, all of the models seem to be operating at the macro-level. That is to say, there is not much offered in terms of micro-level processes. Going back to the definition cited at the beginning of this paper from the SSRC, there has been a sense that immigrants are involved in some kind of selective adaptation. How are the factors and questions detailed above being answered at the individual level? What are the available options in this process and how and why are choices being made? In short, how is the individual interacting in the sociocultural milieu? These are questions the models do not address and are imperative for a better understanding of the dynamic ongoing nature of cross cultural adaptation and its impact on identity and languages.

'COST' MANAGEMENT

Although there can often be benefits associated with migration, the process of moving out of one context and into another can be problematic. Change in the present context involves making choices, and managing the consequences (or costs) stemming from them. By and large most immigrants adjust/adapt/acculturate to varying degrees. Such change may be 'natural and inevitable' (Kim, 1988), but it

[15] This concept has implications on 'biculturualism,' 'bilingualism,' and on the acquisition and transmission of culture. For sake of brevity, it is merely introduced here.

[16] Here Wolcott draws much needed attention to the over-whelming demands placed on 'native-like' proficiency (linguistically and socioculturally) without acknowledging the effort, progress, and competency exhibited by the individual concerned.

does not come without a price.[17] Several studies have highlighted the difficulties associated with such a journey (see for example Ghuman, 1991; Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1991; Stopes-Roe and Cochrane, 1990; Wade and Souter, 1992). How, then, does the process of acculturation impact on the individuals concerned? How does the acculturation-preservation conflict affect the choices these individual make? In this section some of the issues and findings related to the 'costs' of acculturation are discussed.

Berry (1992) identifies changes, specifically associated with acculturation, at the group level (physical, biological, political, economic, cultural, and social) and at the individual level (behavioral shifts, acculturative stress). Of importance here are changes with respect to personal (social, cultural, and ethnic) identity which lead to acculturative stress.

For those in the process of acculturation, sociocultural identity means learning/acquiring a whole new set of indices; in short, it means membership in at least two worlds. As Pearce and Kang (1987) acknowledge, there is a possibility for these individuals to become 'polycultural' as they 'fuse' elements from both the native and host systems to create a 'new' identity. In a number of studies on Asian students the participants identified themselves as bicultural (Berry et al. 1989; Ghuman, 1991; Stopes-Roe & Cochrane, 1990). This identification is a difficult undertaking. There is always the danger that in opening the door to accommodate the new culture one ends up stranded between two doors unable to get into either one (Henze & Vanett, 1993; Hoffman, 1989). Stonequests' 'marginal man' [sic.] (1964) highlights this scenario. Furthermore, movement towards integration, by its very nature, sets up a power relation in favor of the dominant culture. This can lead to questions of inadequacy, incompleteness, or inferiority of the native culture/group.

A number of studies on cross-cultural adaptation have been carried out over the years highlighting this issue of identity and what Berry (1992) has termed acculturative stress. These studies invariably focus on young adults[18] (immigrant or minority children in America or Britain). Given their membership in two worlds (or in Wolcott's terms their ever expanding world), such individuals invariably come across situations/contexts where conflict exists.

Often the two worlds are *different* worlds, where established boundaries make it very difficult to negotiate crossings and adjustments have to be made. Phelan, Davidson, and Cao (1991) present a good description of the "interrelationships between [high school] students' family, peer, and school worlds" (p. 224). In their two-year long study of 54 students in California, students whose cultural, ethical, and religious beliefs ran contrary to those of the school reported adjustment as painful and

[17] There are some who assimilate without any observable (short term) consequences. An argument can be made, however, that even these individuals do 'pay' a price in the long run.

[18] Research has targeted this group and rightly so; they appear to be the most volatile.

difficult. Students noted that fitting in was problematic and gaining access to pre-existing cliques was extremely uncomfortable. Even when they were able to cross between worlds it was not "without personal and psychic costs" (p. 232). They felt that they really did not belong. These students tried to keep their worlds separate; so much so that when others (parents or teachers) crossed over it was a source of anxiety. "Even though many of the students are able to cross perceived boundaries successfully, they are frequently forced to deny aspects of who they are" (p. 245). Feelings of inferiority and insecurity were common in this process.

Having to face racism is an often cited 'cost' of acculturation. Historically, each incoming group has had to endure the brunt of verbal and physical abuse.[19] Visible minorities/immigrants offer a more ready target. Ninety-six percent of the Asian youngsters in Ghuman's study (1991) thought racism existed; eighty-four percent said they had personal experience of it. A number of these participants attempted to understand the feelings of their hosts: "I don't think they hate you or the color — it is just that they think you are different and you are not supposed to be here. Why should you be here? 'Go back to your country,' they shout" (p. 341). There is a sense of reasoning and justifying of the abuse and a constant dialogue within that operates among immigrants in an effort to make sense of their circumstance.

Anwar (1981), reporting on Asians in Britain, states that the Asian community did not perceive that cultural differences between the Asians and the host community led to tension as much as they were the cause of conflict between parents and children within the Asian community. Often when native and host cultures present conflicting choices, these young adults develop strategies 'for keeping both sides happy.' Ghuman (1991) reports of hearing that "a number of Muslim girls keep make-up kits in the school lockers and are adept at changing from 'demure' looking Pakistani girls to self-confident, attractive [sic] Western girls" (p. 335).[20] Developing strategies to counter conflict is healthy; for example, in the Phelan, Davidson, and Cao study (1991) some students who found it difficult to "hang out" with the "in-group" at lunch time joined a student group that practiced at noon. When strategies involve deception and denial (as in the case of the Muslim girls), living in two worlds can carry a heavy psychological burden as detailed in the following account:

> I lead a double life...I do one set of things at home, but I do whatever I want when I'm at school. If I acted wild and crazy at home, or if my friends knew of some of the things I do, my parents would be socially ostracized. People would view me as a bad example for their children. They [friends] are like me. We go through the religious motions just to keep our parents happy.[21]

---

[19] In Canada, for example, Chinese, Italians, East-Indians, Eastern-Europeans, and more recently South-East Asians have at one time or another been the targeted group.

[20] A somewhat different situation occurred recently in Montreal, Canada, where a Muslim girl was sent home for wearing the religious head cover, *hijab*, to school.

[21] This is an excerpt from an article posted on a newsgroup on the Internet.

At any given time, there can be peer pressure from the host culture, sociocultural pressure from the native culture, and familial responsibilities from the immediate/extended family impacting on their 'presentation of self in everyday life' (Goffman, 1959); all of which can make for a fragile and schizophrenic existence. These individuals continually face 'very distressing conflict laden situations with respect to the many and varied roles they are required to play' (Wade and Souter, 1992, p. 14). These forces appear to vary across religious boundaries and are more focused on females than on males (Ghuman, 1991; Stopes-Roe & Cochrane, 1990; Wade & Souter, 1992).[22]

Ethnic minority children are said to undergo *enculturation* in their own ethnic culture as well as *acculturation* to the dominant culture (Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cota, & Ocampo, 1993). As a result, their 'identity,' or sense of self, is continually challenged both from within and without. Too much acculturation (or an excessive desire to assimilate) may be viewed negatively by an individual's family or native group community (Hoffman, 1989) and thereby 'alienate' and separate family members. Intergenerationl conflict, however, can serve to weaken (or break) much-needed family support systems.[23] "The overall picture which emerges is of parents willing, though not longing, to change...and of young people changing although still keeping, and even clinging to, many of their parents' traditional ways" (Stopes-Roe & Cochrane, 1990, p. 199). What is even more alarming is the finding that often parents, teachers, and school administrators are unaware of the problems/challenges faced by these young individuals (Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1991).

The process of acculturation can, and often does, have an adverse impact on the individual concerned. In short, acculturation has a price. As immigrants adjust to their new surroundings they are constantly defining their ethnic and sociocultural identity, and seeking to fit into their chosen (or not) environment. These personal 'identities' are important to one's self worth. Conflict between native and host cultures is heightened where the two cultures are dissimilar (Schneider & Lee, 1990), and across religious groups (Ghuman, 1991). Individuals caught in this conflict tend to adopt coping strategies which invariably leads to feelings of confusion and deprivation which in turn add to the acculturative stress. The costs of acculturation are numerous and must be accounted for in order to get a fuller understanding of the dynamics of cross-cultural adaptation.

---

[22] Most Asian sociocultures place stronger restrictions on females; most of the parents in the studies cited here were more restrictive and less tolerant of their daughters. These women, thus, experience a more rigorous process.

[23] A good current example is that of the latest super-model, Yasmeen Ghouri. Her 'escape' away from her traditional upbringing has been linked to her parent's failed marriage and the lack of support offered by her devoutly religious and 'controlling' father (who *was* a religious leader in Montreal). Her case is interesting in that it also highlights the particular demands placed on females.

LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Given this background what role can language education play in this process? Most bilingual education programs in the United States are viewed as academically compensatory for language minority students (Fishman, 1979). Immigrant students are seen as lacking cultural know-how and English language skills; further, their cultural heritage and first language skills are not valued (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988). The language and culture that these immigrant students bring into their new environment are seen as deficiencies simply because they are different from the dominant host society (Collins, 1988). Deficiency theories essentially claim that something is wrong with language minority students and that they need to be "fixed" through compensatory types of programs. Researchers have identified and grouped these externally imposed deficiencies according to how language is spoken (Bereiter & Engelmann, 1966) and how language is used (Whiteman & Deutsch, 1968). They conclude that minority children lack verbal stimulation in the home and, therefore, are unable to develop complex cognitive patterns. In the past, the notion of deficiency has been used to explain the reasons for low academic success among language minority students; current research, however, has shown that this line of reasoning no longer constitutes a viable explanation (Henze & Vanett, 1993; Hoffman, 1989; Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1991; Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1991).

Educational anthropologists have strongly refuted the explanation that the main reason for school failure among minority children was because they were culturally deficient. They suggest that low school achievement and morale of minority students is the result of cultural differences between teachers and students in verbal and nonverbal communication styles (Delgado-Gaitan, 1987; Erickson, 1987; Heath, 1983; Philips, 1983). Both the teacher and student come from cultures in which the discourse or ways of speaking and listening differs from the other's "speech network" (Hymes, 1972). Unaware of the differences in communication styles of minority students, misunderstanding and miscommunication occurs and teachers use clinical labels and attribute internal traits to students (e.g., "unmotivated") rather than exploring underlying cultural differences (Erickson, 1987).

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Bilingual education has been instrumental in countering school failure based on linguistic and cultural differences. There are a variety of programs for language minority students that are called "bilingual." A closer examination of such programs, however, reveals that there are different types of bilingual programs which vary in the effect they have on immigrant students. In addition, there are other factors such as language proficiency, cultural identity and affiliation, social status among language minority peers, and school culture that contribute to the success/failure of these students (Carranza, 1977; Carter & Segura, 1979; Celce-Murcia, 1983; Coste, 1983; Olsen, 1988; Spindler & Spindler, 1987a, 1987b; Syed, 1995; Wong-Filmore, 1986).

One of the reasons that language minority students find it difficult to excel at school is due, in part, to the type(s) of program utilized for language minority students. August and Garcia (1988) have identified six types of language programs: (1) transitional bilingual education, (2) maintenance bilingual education, (3) submersion model, (4) English as a second language, (5) immersion or sheltered English, and (6) the immersion model. In examining these six types of programs, Malakoff and Hakuta (1990) suggest that although the native language of the student is utilized to varying degrees, most programs only help the student to learn the English language while losing their native language. The majority of these programs use the native language only to help the student transition over to English — subtractive bilingualism. Research has shown that students in subtractive bilingual programs experience negative cognitive effects, because the development of the first language does not play a major role in the development of second language proficiency as it should (Collier, 1989). Other programs such as immersion programs and maintenance bilingual education are called "additive" because "they develop and maintain proficiency in two languages" (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990, p. 39).

Subtractive types of programs do not recognize the importance of maintaining the students' first language in order to successfully learn a second, or additional, language. Some teachers still maintain the notion that it only takes about three months to a year to learn a language. Informal observations hypothesize that children can acquire a second language as quickly as six weeks (Epstein, 1977), but language development in all aspects of language use are not taken into consideration. Collier (1989) synthesized research findings on academic achievement in a second language, and concluded it will take limited English proficient students four to seven years to reach sufficient proficiency in English to carry out tasks required in an academic setting.

Research on second language learning over the past 30 years has shown that a solid foundation in the first language facilitates the acquisition of a second language (Hakuta, 1986). A number of reason have been highlighted in the literature. An important reason is that the native language proficiency of a student has shown to be a good predictor of how fast he/she can acquire a second language. In a longitudinal study of bilingual education programs carried out over a period of three years, Hakuta (1987) discovered that there was a high correlation between Spanish and English vocabulary scores of several groups of Puerto Rican children. In cross sectional studies, Cummins (1984) and Snow (1987) detail similar findings in measuring proficiency in two languages. Clearly, maintenance of native language skills helps the student in accelerating the acquisition of English and does not retard the student's progress, as it was once believed (Ramirez, Yuen, & Ramey, 1991).

A second reason for maintaining and developing the native language stems from the understanding that proficiency in a language requires a collection of skills that are not correlated. Proficiency cannot be measured unidimensionaly. Cummins (1981) explains that there are two types of language proficiency that are needed in order to perform academic work: basic inter-personal communication skills (BICS) and

cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP). BICS is used in day-to-day interactions, while CALP is required for academic work. According to Cummins (1981), developing BICS in the second language will only take a few years of exposure to the new language. CALP, however, is developed not only *in* school, but also beyond the framework of institutional academic learning. When language minority students are proficient in their first language, CALP skills that have developed can transfer from the first language to the second language — if the student has had the opportunity to "analyze and manipulate context-reduced cognitively demanding texts" (Quintanar-Sarellana, Huebner, & Jensen, 1993, p. 210). Language minority students commonly fail to develop high levels of academic second language skills because there is little or no opportunity to look at their first language analytically (Cummins, 1981).

The age of acquisition (AOA) and the length of residence (LOR) are measures that are used frequently when reporting second language acquisition results of immigrants. AOA refers to the students age when they came into the country and were exposed to the second language and the age at which they begin schooling (full time or part time) in the second language. LOR refers to the number of months or years of exposure to the second language both inside and outside of the classroom. Cummins (1981) and Genesee (1978) found older students to be efficient second language learners because their skills to abstract, classify, and generalize in their first language enables them to use such skills to aid in the acquisition of the second language for academic purposes. Older students tend to perform better than their younger counterparts because older students are cognitively mature.[24] The material covered in secondary school is cognitively complex and sequential; content knowledge for each subject is dependent upon work done in earlier grades. When the academic work is discontinued in the home or at school in order for the student to acquire the second language, there might not be enough time to make up for "the lost years of academic instruction" (Collier, 1987). Consequently, these students often end up playing catch up to their mainstream peers. It is perhaps this notion, of the immigrant student constantly trying to catch up with their mainstream peers, that needs to be explored when examining and assessing immigrant students' academic development.

Finally, Angle (1978), in his study which looks at how language maintenance and language shift affect occupational achievement, gives two reasons why non-English speakers should retain their native language. First, he says that maintaining their first language helps to retain their identity in terms of their distinct culture and enables them to control the rate of assimilation to the dominant culture because there is "the feeling of powerlessness and anomie which may accompany the arrival of a person of a different culture in an American city" (Angle, 1978, p. 5). Another reason for maintaining one's native language is the promotion of ethnic consciousness. To deal psychologically with the immigration experience, Rose (1974) says that an awareness of ethnicity and group identity for immigrants have

[24] When norms appropriate to age and gender were compared, however, the differences between the two lessened.

advantages. As discussed earlier, support systems within ones own ethnic/sociocultural group can help in dealing with the feelings of rejection by the majority culture. This kind of environment provides the opportunity for recognition and affirmation for the newly arrived immigrant. "The ethnic consciousness movement generally does not support ethnic or linguistic separatism, but a viable participation in two worlds, in that of the English-speaking majority culture, particularly at the workplace where a living must be gained, and in that of the possibly non-English-speaking minority culture, centered in the home and neighborhood" (Angle, 1978, pp. 5–6).

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

An important yet usually unexplored area that impacts language minority students academic participation and success is the school community.[25] It may be clear to some educators (most of whom are trained to measure growth under instructed learning) that the problems language minority students face are directly correlated to their lack of English-language skills. However, anthropologists in their effort to "describe the social system and cultural behavior within the educational institution and to place it in the context of the community" (Kimball, 1974), have pointed to sociocultural influences. Eckert's ethnographic study analyzes "adolescent social categories in high school and how they mediate the larger social dynamics affecting adolescents both in and out of school" (Patthey-Chavez, 1993, p. 37). She discovered that success among students from an all-white school could not be ascribed to aptitude nor effort. Success can be accredited to an in-school system, which is a type tracking system of adolescent social categorization which the school as an organization cultivates (Eckert, 1989). She states

> The statistics of school participation and success translate in virtually all public high schools into two opposed and polarized social categories that mediate adult socioeconomic class for the adolescent age group. In the Detroit area, people who center their social lives in the school's extracurricular sphere are called (and call themselves) "Jocks," while those who reject the school as a basis for social identity are called (and call themselves) "Burn-outs"...While the names of these categories, and the specific styles that signal their opposition (clothing, musical tastes, territorial specialization, etc.), change through time and between regions and localities, the fundamental status of this opposition is close to universal in our culture. [1989a, pp. 2–3]

Social status of the language minority students can also be attributed to low academic success. According to the empowerment framework of Cummins (1986, 1989), he recognizes that economic and political power relations are significant in terms of how schools function to replicate the social order of society. "Schools academically disable members of politically and economically dominated groups

[25] School environment and school culture have been directly linked with students' motivation, attitude, and academic success. Syed (1995) found that students at two colleges identified school administration, quality and nature of school facilities, and amount and quality of communication between student and school administrators as being direct influences in their academic motivation and performance.

because the social relations within schools replicate the unequal intergroup relations of society at large" (Zangar, 1991, p. 14). Studies on the expectation states theory (Cohen, 1980; Cohen & Sharan, 1982) show that group members used their preconceived notion of each other's status to determine competence on the tasks presented. High status members were evaluated more highly in terms of expectations to perform better on the tasks and to contribute more than low status members (language minority students), because high status members were expected to do so (Cohen & Sharan, 1982). To get high and low status participants to perceive each other as equals, Cohen and Roper (1972) successfully applied a treatment in which the low status participants became the teachers of the high status participants on a task presented to them both. The groups that went through the treatment were interacting on a equal status level where neither black nor white participants were found to be in top-rank positions.

Immigrant students' academic motivation, participation, and success are dependent on a number of internal and external factors. Educators need to account for issues related to first language use and maintenance, cultural identity and affiliation, community support systems, and school environment when assessing these students. It is clear that maintaining and developing students' first language can have a positive impact on a number of these issues.

INITIAL STEPS

In order to improve the unequal status of relationships among language minority students (immigrants who are in the initial stages of cross-cultural adjustment), educational programs need to alter the relationship between educators and minority students (Cummins, 1986). Given that students in bilingual programs are mostly immigrant students for whom English is a second, or additional, language, there is a general perception that bilingual programs are remedial types of classes and that these students are low academic achievers. Such assumptions need to be addressed and corrected. Conversely, the language skills and cultural knowledge these individuals bring with them needs to be acknowledged, maintained, and developed. A few projects have already begun to take these necessary steps.

A project reported by Quintanar-Sarellana, Huebner, & Jenson (1993) at Campbell Union High School (CUHS) in San Jose, California attempts to use "Spanish-speaking high school students to develop their language and literacy skills by employing them as tutors for Spanish foreign language students." CUHS was faced with a common problem in foreign language education, namely that students who were taking a foreign language did not demonstrate functional proficiency — even after four years of study. Additionally, Spanish-speaking students lacked a positive self-image with respect to their language and culture. These students needed to understand that the language skills that they had in Spanish were of great value and it would be important for them to continue to develop their knowledge of Spanish. The project proved to alleviate the social distance between language minority students and mainstream students, raise academic achievement of Hispanic

students, lower high school drop-out rates among Hispanics, and improve Spanish foreign language classes (Quintanar-Sarellana, Huebner, & Jenson, 1993).

Another example of this effort to recognize immigrant students as a linguistic resource was a project conducted by the Center for Second Language Research and funded by the National Foreign Language Resource Center at the University of Hawai'i (see Shonle & Thompson Rolland, this volume, for a more detailed description). Through a partnership between the university and a local high school in Hawai'i, the immigrant high-school students tutored university students who were studying a foreign language. The project aimed to benefit both parties. Specifically, it was designed to (1) alleviate academic failure and facilitate access to higher education for "at risk," traditionally underrepresented, immigrant language minority students (e.g., Ilokano-, Tagalog-, Vietnamese-, and Samoan-speaking students), and (2) foster the development of foreign language proficiency among native English-speaking university students studying these languages in the Departments of Indo-Pacific Languages and Asian Languages and Literature. The project not only served to meet these concerns but went a long way in addressing some of the issues resulting from cross-cultural adjustment discussed earlier (see Shonle & Thompson Rolland, this volume; Burnett and Syed, this volume, for detailed outcomes and analysis).

CONCLUSION

Clearly there is a need for projects such as those described above at all levels of education. Education program developers and language educators need to understand that cross-cultural adjustments are not linear (or unidirectional) in nature and can be difficult and often exercise a cost on the individuals concerned. Acculturation does not mean giving up one's linguistic, cultural, and social identities but a fusing of elements in forming an emerging identity. Adjusting into a new sociocultural environment is a complex process that invariably calls into question and review, one's own values, norms, and beliefs. Individuals caught in this process are often presented with difficult and conflicting choices, and have to deal with a number of issues (alienation, racism, survival, etc.) that leave them psychologically, emotionally, and physically drained. It is precisely in negotiating their emerging identities and managing their multiple cultural memberships that these tensions come to light.

Teachers and administrators need to account for and understand these issues. They need to stop viewing language minority students as deficient or academically unmotivated, and recognize that language minority students are a language resource that can "contribute to American education, diplomacy and international business" (Presidents' Commission of Foreign Language and International Studies, 1980, p. 19). By building on native language proficiency and native cultural identity, schools can provide the kind of learning environment necessary for these students to mediate cross-cultural adjustment and develop a positive self-image. Both these factors are essential if these students are to succeed academically and socially.

REFERENCES

Angle, J. (1978). *Language maintenance, language shift, and occupational achievement in the United States*. San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, Inc.

Anwar, M. (1981). Young Muslims in Britain. In M. W. Khan (Ed.), *Education and society in the Muslim world* (pp. 100–121). London: Hodder and Stoughton.

August, D., &Garcia, E. E., (1988). *Language minority education in the United States: Research, policy, and practice*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, S. (1966). *Teaching disadvantaged children in preschool*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: theory, models and some new findings* (pp. 9–25). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Berry, J. W. (1992). Acculturation and adaptation in a new society. *International Migrations, 30*, 69–85.

Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology, 38*(2), 185–206.

Carranza, M. (1977). *Language attitudes of Mexican American adults: Some sociolinguistic implications*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame.

Carter, T. P., & Segura, R. D. (1979). *Mexican Americans in school: A decade of change*. New York: CEEB.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1983). Problem solving: A bridge builder between theory and practice. In J. E. Alatis, H. H. Stern, & P. Strevens (Eds.), *Applied linguistics and the preparation of second language teachers: Toward a rationale* (pp. 97–105). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Cohen, E. (1980). Design and redesign of the desegregated school: Problems of status power and conflict. In W. Stephan & J. Feagin (Eds.), *Desegregation: Past, present, and future* (pp. 251–278). New York: Plenum.

Cohen, E., & Roper, S. (1972). Modification of interracial interaction disability: An application of status characteristics theory. *American Sociological Review, 37*, 643–652.

Cohen, E., & Sharan, S. (1982). Modifying status relations in Israeli youth. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 11*, 364–84.

Collier, V. P. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*, 617–641.

Collier, V. P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(3), 509–531.

Collins, J. (1988). Language and Class in Minority Education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 19*, 299–326.

Coste, D. (1983). International aspects of teacher training. In J. E. Alatis, H. H. Stern, & P. Strevens (Eds.), *Applied linguistics and the preparation of second*

language teachers: Toward a rationale (pp. 116–123). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Cummins, J. (1981). Empirical and theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education. *Journal of Education*, Winter, pp. 16–29.

Cummins, J. (1984). Linguistic interdependence among Japanese and Vietnamese immigrant children. In C. Rivera (Ed.), *Communicative competence approaches to language proficiency assessment: Research and applications* (pp. 60–81). Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Education Review*, 56, 18–36.

Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students*. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Delgado-Gaitan, J. (1987). Parent perceptions of school: Supportive environments for children. In H. Trueba (Ed.), *Success or failure?: Learning and the language minority student* (pp. 131–155). New York: Newbury House.

Eckert, P. (1989). *Jocks and Burnouts: Social categories and identity in high school*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Edwards, J. (1985). *Language, society, and identity*. New York: Blackwell.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1954). *The absorption of immigrants*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Epstein, N. (1977). *Language, ethnicity, and the schools: Policy alternative for bilingual-bicultural education*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, the George Washington University.

Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18, 335–382.

Ferdman, B. (1990). Literacy and cultural identity. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60(2), 347–371.

Fishman, J. (1979). Bilingual education: What and why? In H. Trueba & C. Barnett-Mizrahi (Eds.), *Bilingual multicultural education and the professional: From theory to practice* (pp. 11–19). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: the role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.

Genesee, F. (1978). Is there an optimal age for starting second language instruction? *McGill Journal of Education*, 13, 145–154.

Ghuman, P. A. S. (1991). Have they passed the cricket test? A 'qualitative' study of Asian adolescents. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 12(5), 327–346.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.

Goodenough, W. (1971). *Culture, language, and society: McCaleb module in anthropology*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Guy, G. (1989). International perspectives on linguistic diversity and language rights. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 13(1), 45–53.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism*. New York: Basic Books.

Hakuta, K. (1987). Degree of bilingualism and cognitive ability in mainland Puerto Rican children. *Child Development, 58*, 1372–1388.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Henze, R., & Vanett, L. (1993). To walk in two worlds — or more? Challenging a common metaphor of native education. *Anthropology and Education, 24*(2), 116–134.

Hoffman., D. (1989). Language and culture acquisition among Iranians in the United States. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 20*(2), 118–132.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Pantheon Books.

International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (IESS). (1968). (Vol. 1). Macmillan Company and The Free Press, USA.

Kim, Y. Y. (1990). Acculturation of Korean immigrants: What are the hidden costs? In H. C. Km & E. H. Lee (Eds.), *Korean in America: Dreams and realities* (pp. 193–216). Seoul: The Institute of Korean Studies.

Kim, Y. Y. (1988). *Communication and cross-cultural adaptation*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Kimball, S. T. (1974). *Culture and the education process*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Knight, G., Bernal, M., Garza, C., Cota, M., & Ocampo, K. (1993). Family socialization and the ethnic identity of Mexican-American children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 24*(1), 99–114.

Kulick, D. (1994). *Language shift and cultural change*. Workshop on language maintenance and shift. Australian Linguistic Institute, La Trobe University, Australia, July 9.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. Hong Kong: Longman.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer

Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1991). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students. In M. Minami & B. Kennedy (Eds.), *Language issues in literacy and bilingual/multicultural education* (pp. 456–482). Cambridge: Harvard Educational Review.

Malakoff, M., & Hakuta, K. (1990). History of language minority education in the United States. A. M. Padilla, H. H. Fairchild, & C. M. Valadez (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies* (pp. 27–43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Murphy, H. (1975). Low rate of mental hospitalization shown by immigrants to Canada. In C. Zwingmann & G. Pfister-Ammendes (Eds.), *Uprooting and after* (pp. 221–231). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Ogbu, J. (1987). Variability in minority school performance: A problem in search of an explanation. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18*, 312–334.

Olsen, L. (1988). *Crossing the school house border: Immigrant students in the California public schools*. San Francisco: California Tomorrow.

Oxford English dictionary (2nd ed.). (1989). (Vol. 1). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Padilla, A. M. (1980). The role of cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty in acculturation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings* (pp. 47–84). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Patthey-Chavez, G. G. (1993). High school as an arena for cultural conflict and acculturation for Latino Angelinos. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 24*, 33–60.

Pearce, W. B., & Kang, K. (1987). Acculturation and communication competence. In D. L. Kincaid (Ed.), *Communication theory: Eastern and western perspectives* (pp. 235–244). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Phelan, P., Davidson, A., & Cao, H. (1991). Students' multiple worlds. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 22*(3), 224–249.

Philips, S. U. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian reservation*. New York: Longman.

Presidents' Commission of Foreign Language and International Studies. (1980). Strength through wisdom: A critique of US capability. *The Modern Language Journal, 64*, 9–57.

Quintanar-Sarellana, R., Huebner, T., & Jensen, A., (1993). Tapping a natural resource: Language minority students as foreign language tutors. In B. J. Merino, H. T. Trueba, & F. A. Samaniego (Eds.), *Language and culture in learning: Teaching Spanish to native speakers of Spanish* (pp. 208–221). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Ramirez, J. D., Yuen, S. D., & Ramey, D. R. (1991). *Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children*. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum for the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist, 38*, 149–152.

Renato, R. (1985). Assimilation revisited. *Working Paper Series No. 9*. Stanford University.

Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics*. Essex, England: Longman.

Rose, P. (1974). *They and we: Second education*. New York: Random House.

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Schmidt, R. W. (1983). Interaction, acculturation, and the acquisition of communicative competence: A case study of an adult. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 137–174). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Schneider, B., & Lee, Y. (1990). A model for academic success. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 21*(4), 359–377.

Schumann, J. (1978). The acculturation model for second-language acquisition. In R. C. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 27–50). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Schumann, J. (1986). Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 7*(5), 379–391.

Schumann, J. (1990). Extending the scope of the acculturation/pidginization model to include cognition. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(4), 667–684.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988). Multilingualism and the education of minority of children. In Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 10–44). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Snow, C. (1987). Beyond conversation: Second language learners' acquisition of description and explanation. In J. Lantolf & A. Lavarca (Eds.), *Research in second language learning: Focus on the classroom* (pp. 3–16). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Social Science Research Council. (1954). Acculturation: An exploratory formulation. *American Anthropologist, 56*, 973–1000.

Spindler, G., & Spindler, L. (1987a). *The interpretive ethnography of education: At home and abroad.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Spindler, G., & Spindler, L. (1987b). Cultural dialogue and schooling in Schoenhausen and Roseville: A comparative analysis. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18*, 3–16.

Stauble, A. (1978). Decreolization: A model for second language development. *Language Learning, 28*, 29–54.

Stonequist, E. V. (1964). The marginal man. In W. Burgess, & D. Bogue (Eds.), *Contributions to urban sociology* (pp. 327–345). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Stopes-Roe, M., & Cochrane, R. (1990). *Citizens of this country: The Asian-British.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Syed, Z. (1995). *Achievement motivation and school culture: Exploring contextual factors in student motivation.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Taft, R. (1953). The shared frame of reference concept applied to the assimilation of immigrants. *Human Relations, 6*, 45–55.

Wade, B., & Souter, P. (1992). *Continuing to think: The British Asian girl.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Wolcott, H. (1991). Propriospect and the acquisition of culture. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 22*(3), 251–273.

Whiteman, M., & Deutsch, M. (1968). Social disadvantage as related to intellective and language development. In M. Deutsch, I. Katz, & A. Jensen, (Eds.), *Social class, race and psychological development* (pp. 86–115). New York: Hold, Rinehart & Winston.

Willet, J. (1995). Becoming first graders in a second language: An ethnographic study of second language socialization. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(3), 473–503.

Wong-Filmore, L. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.) (pp. 648–685). New York: Macmillan.

Young, M. Y., & Gardner, R. C. (1990). Modes of acculturation and second language proficiency. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, *22*(1), 59–71.

Zangar, V. V. (1991). Social and cultural dimensions of the education of language minority students. In A. N. Ambert (Ed.), *Bilingual education and English as a second language: A research handbook, 1988–1990* (pp. 3–54). New York: Garland Publishing Inc.

Zafar Syed
Military Language Institute, United Arab Emirates

LEARNING WITH OTHERS: COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIP IN EDUCATION

"I hear and I forget. I see and I remember. I do (with others) and I understand"
–ancient Chinese proverb

EARLY LESSONS

One of the things I immediately noticed during my 4-year-old's recent pre-school orientation was the emphasis the teachers placed on having children work together and share school resources. The notion of sharing, of collaborating with others, is also a common theme in much of the children's educational programming on public television in the United States and Canada. From an early age children are taught to share their toys and materials with siblings, neighborhood friends, visiting relatives, and classroom peers. Early childhood education in many sociocultural settings also places an importance on sharing communal property (taking turns on the swing, sharing classroom resources) and working towards a common goal (cleaning up before going out to play). Within the North American context, this education continues at home as family roles mature.[1] Doing errands around the house or helping with dinner teaches young adults the value of dividing labor and contributing some form of effort and expertise that benefits all. In later life as we become involved in relationships, marriage, and professions, collaboration continues to be a reoccurring theme. Despite the early lessons learned and this practical lifelong need, collaboration becomes less of a focus in formal education. In contrast, there is a shift towards competition and individualistic performance assessment.

Research in the social sciences has linked collaboration with individuals' cognitive, linguistic, social, and personal development (Brisk, 1991; Campione & Brown, 1987; Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978; Vygotsky, 1981). Others have championed the role of collaboration in institutional development, professional development, and educational reform (Bembry, 1995; Corey, 1953; Crookes, 1993; Elliot, 1977; Freeman, 1982; Hawkinson, 1992; Lieberman, 1986; Oberg & McCutcheon, 1990; Pine, 1986; Sirotnik, 1988; Tikunoff & Ward, 1983; Trist, 1977). This chapter proposes to explore the notion of collaboration as it relates to learning and research.

[1] This is true of many other sociocultural settings, (e.g., Indian, Japanese, Eskimo, Hawaiian; see for example, Fienup-Riordan, 1990; Lee, 1991; Malo, 1951; Stopes-Roe & Cochrane, 1990; Uba, 1994).

Syed, Z. (1999). Learning with others: Collaboration and partnership in education. In K. A. Davis (Ed.), *Foreign language teaching and language minority education*. (Technical Report pp. 65–82). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

The process of collaboration will be examined for the benefits and disadvantages it holds for the participants, leading to an identification of four essential elements necessary for successful collaborative effort. Finally, an account of how the Foreign Language Partnership Project (FLPP) highlights and exemplifies collaborative initiatives in language learning will be detailed.

COLLABORATION AND LEARNING

A comprehensive sociocultural theory of learning, which takes into account the power of collaborative effort, is detailed in the works of the Russian psychologist Vygotsky (1978). Vygotsky was keen on drawing a relationship between individuals' learning and social interaction. He believed that cognitive development was a result of being involved with others in purposeful activities. This involvement takes the form of an apprenticeship and learning occurs through the collaboration of a novice and a more competent other(s), where the latter assists the former through modeling, guidance, and explanation. In Vygotskian philosophy, this interaction is most beneficial if it falls within the child's "zone of proximal development" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 84). The zone is an abstract representation, or map, of what a child can accomplish independently (for which they have a developed repertoire of strategies and skills) and what s/he can do with assistance (which is viewed as a developmental potential). Through his/her mediation with a more qualified expert, the child is able to appropriate and internalize the ways of accomplishing activities (Rogoff, 1990). This is a gradual process of internalizing what the child observes in social interaction to intrapersonal development (Campione & Brown, 1987):

> At the outset, the child and adult work together, with the adult doing most of the work and serving as an expert model. As the child acquires some degree of skill, the adult cedes the child responsibility for part of the job and does less of the work. Gradually, the child takes more of the initiative, and the adult serves primarily to provide support and help when the child experiences problems. Eventually, the child internalizes the initially joint activities and becomes capable of carrying them out independently. At the outset, the adult is the model, critic, and interrogator, leading the child toward expertise; at the end, the child adopts these self-regulation and self-interrogation roles. (p. 83)

While it is not entirely clear how this transfer takes place, there is evidence to suggest that a collaborative partner *can* aid the learner to exploit resources s/he already has but is unable to consciously control (Avala & Yano, 1994; Brisk, 1991; Karmiloff-Smith, 1979; Wertsch, 1979) within what has also been referred to as the zone of instructional sensitivity (Brown & Ferrara, 1985).

The Vygotskian approach offers three very important implications: the benefits of feedback, the role of modeling, and the benefits of observing and noticing things. Each of these act as a demystification process for the novice learner and enhances his/her self-concept.

Studies in education (Avala & Yano, 1994; Hasbach, 1992; Tudoe, 1990) and the literature in second language education (Chaudron, 1988; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Long 1977) have drawn attention to the importance of feedback in learning. In the Vygotskian scheme, feedback is an essential component in the cognitive development of the learner. For feedback to be effective it must be accessible and comprehensible for the less advanced partner (Krashen, 1982). It is through this process of negotiating meaning from the feedback of a more qualified partner that assimilation of new information is achieved. Similarly, it has been shown that children learn from observing how a more competent partner approaches a particular problem, what strategies s/he employs in solving it, and how this process is organized to arrive at a suitable answer (Bembry, 1995; Brisk, 1991; Cattelli, 1995; Oxford, 1990; Wenden & Rubin, 1987). Providing a model for learners to imitate and invariably build upon is the cornerstone of apprenticeship learning. Finally, the notion of observing others allows the participants to share displays of thinking (Erickson, 1989) which can serve to heighten awareness. The novice learner is able to notice the patterns and practices which go into completing tasks and solving problems.

These three concepts —providing feedback, an exemplary model, and opportunity for observation— in essence serve to demystify learning and build learners self concept. Part of being a novice is simply being unaware of how things are done, words pronounced, solutions sought, or "how to use what you already know in order to go beyond what you currently think" (Bruner, 1983, p. 183). Once this process is modeled and consequently observed in the more expert partner, and feedback provided on initial attempts, the novice develops an increasing familiarity with this procedure. Additionally, this kind of apprenticeship learning allows the novice to become aware and take notice of what is involved in the progression from problem to solution. This is an integral part in not only learning new information but a key factor in the attitudinal stance the learner takes in future learning (Rosaen, 1992; Schmidt, 1995). This familiarity has a "been there, done that" mentality to it which allows the novice the confidence to approach future endeavors in a more self-assured manner. Research in this area suggest a strong reciprocal relationship between self concept and academic achievement and that "enhancing the self concept has a vital influence in improving academic performance" (Purkey, 1970, p. 27). Collaborative research often points to this growing self-concept in collaborative efforts (Bembry, 1995; Brisk, 1991; Burnett & Syed, this volume; Syed, 1997; Williamson, Gloadon, & Hutchinson, 1990) as an important and long lasting effect.

Research in language learning provides further support for collaboration. Second language acquisition literature stresses the importance of language learning in authentic and meaningful contexts where students have opportunities to use the language for actual communicative purposes (Ellis, 1985; Genesee, 1987). They also point to the facilitative nature of collaboration in language learning (Nunan, 1992). Bilingual education scholars (Cummins, 1986; Rosaldo, 1989; Trueba, 1987, 1989) and research done with minority student populations (Brisk, 1991; Burnett & Syed, this volume; 1990; Henze & Vanett, 1993; Hoffman, 1989; Lucas, Henze, &

Donato) identify the importance of linguistic and cultural identity as having measured influence in students' academic success. They maintain that collaboration involving these students must value the culture, language, literacy, and characteristics that these individuals bring with them. Again, there is an implication that self concept, identity, and self worth are important factors in learning.

COLLABORATION AND RESEARCH

COLLABORATIVE ACTION RESEARCH

Collaborative inquiry originated in the action research models of the 1940's and 1950's (Catelli, 1995). Collaborative action research has encouraged researchers and teachers to work together and focus on questions/problems stemming from classroom practice (D. J. Fox, 1969; Pine, 1979). Action research has been held by many as a viable means of educational reform (Holly, 1991; Lieberman, 1986; Pine, 1986) and appears to have had its beginning as early as 1875 with the work of Francis Parker and John Dewey who drew from the principles of child-development. It was not until the early 1940's that Kurt Lewin, an American social psychologist, coined the term action research to describe research which utilized the experimental social scientific approach and addressed major social issues (Ebbut, 1985). Lewin's goal was to "bring research and practitioners together in a collaborative relationship to engage in a variety of applied research projects designed to address pressing problems" (Patterson & Shannon, 1993, p. 9). The pressing social problems Lewin alludes to included prejudice, authoritarianism, and imperialism — all of which were a growing concern in this post World War II era.[2] Also in the mid–1940's Abraham Shumsky and Stephen Corey founded the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute at Teacher's College, Columbia University. This institute was one of the earliest examples of a university-school partnership. Corey was among the first to use action research in the field of education. He viewed such practice as "the process by which practitioners attempt to study their problems scientifically in order to guide, correct, and evaluate, their decisions and actions" (Corey, 1953, p. 7). Both Corey and Lewin emphasized the importance of researchers and practitioners (teachers) working in a collaborative effort; they firmly believed that this process would be more conducive to change.

By the mid–1950's and into the 1960's, action research in education fell into disfavor. There was increased criticism from the university scholars who attacked the above methodology, claiming it to be poor, unscientific, and simple. Hodgkinson (1957), in an often quoted vitriol, highlights the concerns: "Perhaps it would be better to describe action research as quantified common sense rather than a form of scientific empirical research" (p. 146). He also openly criticized the competence of the practitioners involved in such inquiry by concluding, "research is no place for an amateur" (p. 142). In addition to such criticism, there was a general

[2] It is both interesting and sad to note that these problems have not dissipated with time but are very much part of our world today.

move within the social sciences of separating research and practice. According to Sanford (1970), this was predicated by a shift in federal funding agencies which supported educational research in the United States. Under this format, scholars applied for research grants, conducted their research and reported their findings to the funding agencies. There was no mechanism for any action linking the findings to educational reforms.

In the 1970's the pendulum had begun to swing back. Researchers began to question the effectiveness of quantitative methodology and the linear model of research[3] in educational settings. As a result, there was renewed interest in action research and several major projects were initiated exploring not only the practical concerns of teaching but also the notion of professionalism in education (Elliot, 1977; Tikunoff & Ward, 1983). Action research became the means not only of teacher education and development but also of bridging the gap between research (theory) and action (practice). This type of research flourished in the 1980's —both with respect to teaching and teacher education— with a plethora of studies in mainstream education (for example, Elliot, 1977; Griffin, Lieberman, & Jacullo-Noto, 1982; Pine, 1979; Tikunoff & Ward, 1983; Whitford, Schelchty, & Shelor, 1987). It became a viable method of conducting educational research which contributed equally to theory and practice. Teacher researchers have gained respect and their findings increasingly appeared in journals and at conferences.[4] In more recent times, action research has been affiliated with critical social theory (Crookes, 1993). Such theory attempts to "provide comprehensive and systematic critique of technical theories of curriculum and schooling and to propose an alternative approach based on collaborative and critically reflective practice by educators working together to transform schools" (Oberg & McCutcheon, 1990, p. 142).

SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS

Sirotnik (1988) asserted that collaborative inquiry of the nature described above was an ideal methodology for school-university partnerships. Sirotnik viewed such partnerships as "evolving, social experiments," complex and ongoing in nature, that champion the social critical call for action and change (p. 169). He operationalized collaborative school-university inquiry as

> ...a process of self-study — of generating and acting upon knowledge, in context, by and for the people who use it. Knowledge will necessarily be developed through the use of quantitative, qualitative and critical methods...Critical methods are based upon conscious, systematic, and rigorous human discourse wherein (1) values, beliefs, interests, and ideologies in the educational setting are made explicit;(2) the

[3] In a linear model, researchers verify findings, give it practical application, and pass it on to the practitioners. This has a danger of creating a gap between researcher and practitioner which usually results in the findings never being implemented into practice.

[4] Several journals have appeared that draw on their focus on 'action' in education (e.g., *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *Action in Teacher Education*, *Journal of Staff Development*, *Theory Into Practice)*. Also, there are now special interest groups, newsletters and other publications within such organizations as TESOL and IATEFL.

need for information is generated; and (3) actions are taken, critically reviewed, retaken, and so forth. (pp. 169–170)

It was believed that the "bumping together of university and school cultures would have a positive effect on both institutions" (Goodlad, 1993, p. 25). Yet, as Goodlad concludes, these two institutions have not always worked in a sustained and productive manner. In fact, there appears to be historical support for the lack of communication and cooperation between schools and universities (Cavanaugh, 1993). Researchers have cited a number of reasons for this failure: (a) differences in the cultures and roles of schools and universities create barriers to collaborative inquiry (DeBevoise 1986; Green, Baldini, & Stack, 1993; Lieberman, 1986); (b) there is a lack of agreement between professors and teachers with respect to aims and objectives of education (Metzner, 1970); and (c) schools and universities are still not fully aware of each other's needs and capabilities (Cavanaugh, 1993). There are a number of prerequisites for any collaboration to be effective (see the section on 'Essential in making it work,' this chapter), but for school-university partnerships to be successful it is additionally important that the power differences underlying the above reasons be addressed and moderated. Universities are generally regarded as places of higher learning where knowledge in the form of research is established and disseminated. Conversely, schools are usually seen as places where such knowledge is received and ideally applied. The resulting differential status can often lead to roles that run counter to the equilateral participation necessary in collaborative efforts. Not only do the research interests of the university faculty need to have direct connection with school based problems (Button, Ponticell, & Johnson, 1996), but there needs to be willingness on the part of both sides to relinquish their traditional roles. University researchers need to give up their expert status and welcome the expertise of others in the community (Noddings 1986) and the school practitioners need to accept roles of reflective inquiry (Corey, 1953; Crookes, 1993). Part of this process is the ability to explore and recognize where needed expertise lies and then utilize it in fostering change.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 (PL 89–329), which sought partnerships between higher education and private agencies, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, (PL 89–10), which requires schools to collaborate with other institutes, Title VII and Public Law 94–142, which brought into contact bilingual education with mainstream education, and the current economic realities in education have all encouraged and at times necessitated collaboration in education. School-university partnerships are growing in numbers. The American Association for Higher Education lists over 1200 partnership projects (Wilbur & Lambert, 1991). The renewed call for collaboration between schools and universities seeks to establish solid communication between the two institutes in order to enhance students' academic development and provide an easier transition between the two (Cavanaugh, 1993). In fact, there is a growing sense in American education that views collaboration —individuals, institutes, and communities working together— as *the* solution to the problem/issues in education (Barnett, 1990; Bembry 1995; Trist, 1977).

There have been a number of successful collaborative efforts involving at-risk[5] students. Brisk (1991) reports on a collaborative model titled, 'Integrated Bilingual Education,' designed to bring together existing, yet isolated, transitional bilingual education programs with mainstream programs in a Massachusetts school system. In the model, bilingual and monolingual teachers and their students form integrated learning clusters for the entire academic year. Teachers plan, teach, evaluate, and share ideas as a group. Brisk cites a number of positive effects of her model:

> The model has created a community which fosters functional bilingualism. It also provides language learning opportunities and the development of positive attitudes towards learning a second language...Languages are learned and maintained because there is a real need to use them, rather than because they are a curriculum requirement (p. 122).

Students in this model have come to realize their own language (cultural) expertise and how they can utilize it to further themselves. Brisk also indicates a growing appreciation and understanding among the teachers involved in her model.

Similar results are presented by van Loenen & Haley (1994) in their Consultative Model — a collaboration between bilingual education and ESL programs. By utilizing the particular expertise of the various teachers involved and the language through content approach, the model was able to provide a 'win-win' situation where students enjoy "language rich experiences...[and] benefit from the increased communication between the special area teachers and regular [sic] education teachers" (pp. 9–10).

A large scale model (Bembry, 1995) involving a partnership among several diverse organizations in the Baltimore area, under the title SUCCESS (Schools, Universities, Community, Committed to Excellence in Service and Scholastics), details the importance of bringing together resources and expertise of different institutions "in a symbolic relationship that meets the needs of all who participate" (p. 261). In this partnership, 'at-risk' public middle school students and university interns are paired with nursing home patients to work on projects "designed to foster a genuine and meaningful relationship" throughout the academic year (p. 258). The model has served to enlarge horizons through experience with people of diverse backgrounds. This type of model goes beyond the solely academic development and includes "development of personal and social competencies...to meet the obligation of today's and future societies" (p. 257).

These models highlight the need for utilizing the various resources and situating learning both at the individual and social levels. With respect to language minority

[5] By at-risk we mean those individuals whose culture, language, and socioeconomic standing fall outside that of mainstream America. It is worth noting that there are considerably more examples of collaboration involving those with physical or learning deficiencies (see for example Prelock, 1995; Ramcharan-Griffin, 1993).

students this includes providing multiple language contexts, language across the curriculum, and first language maintenance (Castaneda, 1992).

ESSENTIALS IN MAKING IT WORK

Though there is increasing support for collaborative efforts in education, implementation has been difficult. Drawing on the above selection of studies and a number of lists highlighting factors needed for effective collaboration (Appley & Winder, 1977; Dubetz, 1995; Hord, 1985), four salient features are categorized here to identify necessary themes in successful collaborative efforts.

Perhaps the most important feature in successful collaboration is that the parties are operating under a shared framework. This means that there are some basic commonalties with respect to the interests, needs, expectations, and desired goals (Appley & Winder, 1977; Button, Ponticell, & Johnson, 1996; Metzner, 1970). There needs to be a sense of working for a common cause. This solidarity is important and can be instrumental in overcoming problems. There is an understanding, appreciation, and acceptance between individuals which develops when there is an overriding awareness that both are working towards a shared dream. It has been suggested that such a framework need also include participants' values and language (Elliot, 1985). Clearly it would be difficult to collaborate with someone who did not share similar professional concerns and ethics. Similarly, sharing a particular discourse through which appropriate exchange of information can occur is an important prerequisite for effective communication. A common framework not only provides impetus for collaboration but offers a solid base from which it can produce desired results.

Collaboration must invariably be an interactive process. That is to say, this sharing of information and ideas needs to be on-going, proactive, and geared towards coalition building (LoBianco, 1990; Hord, 1985) and change. It is imperative that there be two-way communication which allows for a transfer of ideas, information, and resources. It is desirable that this sharing be sustained long enough to establish a working history and effect desired change (Goodlad, 1993). It must be interactive also in ways that see practitioners take initiative to reach out and involve others at different levels (administrators, school boards, community groups) so as to insure impact at all levels. This type of sharing invariably involves an investment of one's time, energy, and resources and entrusting these with others.

There is general consensus that for collaboration to work, the parties need to be voluntary participants in the process. There is a long standing tendency in education to view teaching as a private practice. It has been suggested that part of the rationale for collaborative inquiry in education has been to alleviate pedagogical isolation (Brisk, 1991; C. A. Fox & Faver, 1984). Working with others means making public your beliefs, values, and practice. This can be an intrusive situation for some. There is a danger for teachers to feel as if they are being evaluated for summative purposes which often leads to a fear of involvement (Freeman, 1982;

Hawkinson, 1992). The key is that there be some element of choice in electing to participate and that the focus of participation lies in formative (developmental) not summative processes.

Finally, collaboration requires flexibility and patience — both at the individual and the institutional levels. Participants must be willing to accommodate others' perspectives and agendas within their own. The first step in this process is to relinquish any perceived status or authority and recognize and incorporate the expertise of others — arriving at what Noddings (1986) called research fidelity. At the institutional level, administration needs to support collaborative efforts by providing time (scheduling, release time, etc.), space (facilities and resources) for planning, coordination, and training (Dubetz, 1995). Additionally, institutions must recognize and reward collaborative initiatives (Dubetz, 1995; van Loenen & Haley, 1994) to reflect "the emerging template of school and university restructuring — experimentation, innovation, creativity, and case-by-case inquiry" (Button, Ponticell, & Johnson, 1996, p. 20). Allowing teachers time, resources, opportunities, and incorporating change to reflect their findings is essential for this process to be effective. Collaboration requires persistence and patience to work with the skills, styles, and stamina of others. The practice needs to be supported and recognized at all levels for it to be a viable option for teachers and researchers.

Considering the importance of collaboration in education and the role it can play in school-university partnerships, the University of Hawai'i Center of Second Language Research, funded by the National Foreign Language Resource Center, initiated the Foreign Language Partnership Project (FLPP). The FLPP was designed to promote the 'language as resource' ideology. It was hoped that the project would not only provide insights into foreign language learning at the university level, but promote native language maintenance for language minority students at the high-school level.[6]

FLPP AND COLLABORATION

OVERVIEW

The present project, which ran for two academic years, involved 24 students and 6 teachers at the University of Hawai'i and Farrington High School in Honolulu. Collaboration has been at the heart of the FLPP from the beginning. The project has served to bring together university language teachers and students, high-school teachers and students, and a research team committed to making fundamental change in language education. The impetus for initiating the project was to utilize the expertise of the participants to make inroads in the long standing shortcomings in foreign language education (for a good overview see Ortega, this volume) and in the well documented academic difficulties confronted by linguistic minorities (see

[6] Although there were a number of other findings, only those relating to the collaborative process are detailed here.

Jasso-Aguilar, this volume; Shonle & Thompson Rolland, this volume). The following analysis draws on the above theoretical rationale and details the collaborative nature of this project[7].

PARTNERS IN LEARNING

The project was essentially the pairing up of university foreign language students learning Ilokano, Tagalog, and Samoan, with native-speaking high school students of these languages in a tutoring relationship. As peer tutors, the participants were paired into groups and met two or three times a week during the academic year. As partners, they were able to offer their expertise, a cultural and linguistic model, and an authentic context for language learning. As a result, they were both exposed to, and became familiar with, new discourses and processes.

This partnership was unique in that it was geared to provide two-way expertise. Both the university and the high school partners brought a particular competence that was beneficial for the other. The high school partners contributed their native language and heritage culture knowledge and the university participants their English skills and academic familiarity. The university participants were able to utilize the native proficiency of the high school students and their cultural knowledge and sensitivity in the process of learning a foreign language. The high school participants were able to draw upon the English language skills and academic experience of their partners in developing their second language and academic competence. Both sides provided feedback (through examples and models) that the other could benefit by. Expanding on the Vygotskian notion of expert-novice learning partnerships, the FLPP design was able to establish a mutually beneficial two-way expert-novice relationship. In this manner, each participant was at once a novice and an expert. This somewhat contradictory existence reflects current modes of knowledge and learning. Individuals bring with them a frame of reference, based on their background, that offers a unique perspective. This, in short, is their expertise. By recognizing and utilizing this expertise in collaborative learning, the participants are able to view education as a process of exchange, while maintaining and developing a sense of self.

The partnership also allowed for an exchange of native models. Such models are important in that they provide necessary insights into how language and culture interrelate for a given community. A number of foreign language/studies programs have incorporated a travel abroad component solely for this purpose. Indeed, such components have long been viewed as crucial for students to develop the necessary levels of foreign language competence (Tonkin, 1981). A very useful and immediate alternative to this rather expensive proposition, however, is to utilize the linguistic and sociocultural expertise present in a diverse community. The native models in the FLPP not only provided linguistic and sociolinguistic knowledge but insights into ways of thinking, ways of approaching problems and issues, and ways of

[7] For a complete description of the FLPP see Shonle & Thompson Rolland, this volume. The present analysis focuses on the collaborative aspects.

sessions, students were able to tap into the interests (musical, culinary, fashion, etc.), life styles (living environments, family affiliation, gender roles, etc.), and backgrounds (childhood socialization, sociocultural expectations, etc.) of their partners to gain a level of awareness and understanding that they could not acquire in any language classroom. For many the process answered long-standing questions and clarified numerous misconceptions. This access to cultural discourse was instrumental in their emerging identities.

Working with partners accorded these individuals the opportunity to learn language in relevant, purposeful, and authentic contexts. From the beginning, participants were involved in meaningful discourse. They negotiated the content and process of the tutoring sessions, and worked out a schedule for their weekly meetings. The nature of exchange during these sessions was to clarify (classroom instructions, homework assignments, uncertainties) and inform (explain, teach, and exemplify aspects of one's expertise). The content of this exchange was of immediate relevance. The participants talked about issues (academic and social) that were important to them. This personally constructed agenda was significant in that it reflected areas of specific interest and focused on filling information gaps in their education. Through their interchange, they were able to access necessary information to contextualize their learning. As a result, they were able to attach meanings and formulate hypothesis on issues that were hitherto before vague and unfamiliar. The entire partnership process was thus situated in an authentic, real life context. This was not a teacher designed classroom exercise/activity nor a passive input of reading/textual data. The partners were fully active and participatory in negotiating meaning to arrive at shared understanding.

PARTNERS IN THE PROCESS

As stated earlier, the FLPP involved university language instructors and high school teachers. Although these two groups did not collaborate directly, they did work with the research team to plan and monitor the process. University language instructors (in the three language areas) were solicited for participation. At the beginning of each academic year these teachers met with the research team to explore university student needs and explore possible ways of utilizing native-speaking partners in their language classrooms. These meetings were instrumental in getting a sense of how foreign language teachers approached language education and identifying areas which needed attention to facilitate foreign language proficiency. These language instructors also served to interview potential high school partners for their first language proficiency and sociocultural knowledge to provide input in the selection process. Once the academic semester began, these instructors agreed to having a member of the research team visit their classroom and briefly explain the project. The instructors expressed their support for the project and highlighted potential benefits. They encouraged students to join and made the necessary contact information available. During the course of the semester, these instructors provided feedback on classroom performance of those students who were involved in the project. Feedback was also provided on ways participation in the project was recognized in the students' course grade and evaluation.

project. Feedback was also provided on ways participation in the project was recognized in the students' course grade and evaluation.

The high school teachers involved with this project shared a genuine concern for the poor academic performance among immigrant students. One of the teachers, who was also a graduate student at the university, was familiar with the project and supportive of its goals. The research team, with the help of this teacher, solicited high school students for this project.[8] The teacher also acted as a common referent between the researchers, other teachers, and these students. Once the participants were selected, their high school teachers remained in contact with the research team to provide feedback on students' academic performance and their affective disposition in school.

At the start of the second year the selected high school participants got together with the high school partners of the previous year in an informative social get together where the participants would 'talk story'[9] about their involvement in the project. It was felt that putting these two groups together would be a logical step within the scope of this project. During this meeting incoming students were able to vocalize their concerns and fears, and learn from the expertise and 'wisdom' of their more experienced predecessors. A number of tutoring strategies, processes, and success/failure stories were exchanged. It was also a time for the previous high school partners to reflect on their experience and articulate (for the benefit of others there) what this has meant in their own personal development. As such, they were models for the newcomers.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ALL

The effects of the collaborative participation in FLPP were quite dynamic and possibly long lasting (for those immediately involved). With the aid of their expert partners' model and feedback, and their reciprocal participation in their educational process, the participants expressed a newfound understanding of concepts and issues. There were considerable attitudinal changes (with respect to self, others, language, and education) and an increase in linguistic competence and functionality.[10] The fact that this project utilized the particular competencies of the participants and valued the cultural and linguistic identity these individuals bring with them, takes an important next step in this kind of collaborative exercise. The emerging self concept and how this has impacted the participants' academic performance serve to underscore the need for continued effort in this respect. Educators need to become better aware of the wealth of information and expertise available in our midst, and begin to utilize these resources to their full potential.

---

8 These students were hired as tutors and given an hourly wage for their work.

9 This is a common and traditional format for oral communication in Hawaiian culture. Individuals sit in a circle and exchange their views and feelings by building on what others in the group have said.

10 For a detailed analysis of these results see Shonle and Thompson Rolland, this volume; Syed and Burnett, this volume.

sought,[11] their willingness to be part of this process was conducive to making it work. Given that this was a small scale initiative, it did not involve a large number of participants. Nevertheless, it did produce exemplary data which serves to inform both the University and the school of the possibilities and mutual benefits in such efforts. Considering the current political shift towards conservative policies, the debate on diversity, and educational cutbacks, it proves expedient for those involved in multicultural education, bilingual education, ESL, foreign language/studies education, and minority student populations to draw on common threads and establish coalitions in order to stem this growing tide of obstinate thought. It is in our mutual interest to join forces and present models of collaborations that not only enhance the educational experience for the students but inform institutional change. By breaking down long standing walls that separate language departments in higher education, separate bilingual and 'mainstream' education at the high school, and separate language and content in the classroom, we can begin the necessary dialogue that informs and empowers our practice.

Finally, the personal growth and attitudinal shifts documented by the FLPP points not only to the importance of collaboration in academic success but also in developing an understanding and sensitivity towards others. Through their partnership the participants were able to enter into the world of their partners and see what it meant to make cultural choices and adjustments, learn English or a foreign language, understand the importance of maintaining heritage language and culture, and see things from a different perspective. There are an increasing number of language minority students in education (at all levels). They bring with them a background that is quite different from that of mainstream culture. It would be essential in a growing multicultural, diverse, citizenry that individuals be able to develop not only an understanding of others but also of themselves through others. This ability to share and appreciate different perspectives, while contributing one's own voice, is a necessary condition if these individuals are to co-exist in a peaceful and supportive environment.

LASTING IMAGES

As long as students need the training and experience that are gained from faculty and peers; as long as facilities, instruments, and materials are expensive; as long as resources are limited; as long as professionals specialize; and as long as there are global problems to be tackled —and if Fischer & Abedi (1990) are right that "Knowledge itself is always a cumulative collaborative project"— then collaboration is unavoidable in the world of learning" (quoted in Borden, 1992, p. 141). The importance collaborative effort holds in learning and in initiating educational change is grounded in a tradition that views learning as occurring at both intra- and

[11] It was hoped that the teachers would incorporate these participants in their classroom practice. The high school partners could have served as native voices for classroom activities, while the university partners could have been academic liaison for the high school classroom. Scheduling conflicts, limited resources, and consequently a limited number of participants in the project made this highly problematic.

interpersonal levels. The FLPP model has served to produce interesting and informative data on a collaborative effort in language education. It argues that university-school partnerships must utilize the linguistic expertise of an increasingly diverse student population in the forming of a shared framework on language learning policy and planning. It further asserts that this kind of exercise validates the linguistic and cultural identity of these individuals and can serve to bridge the gap between school and university and thereby be mutually beneficial. Working and learning with others is seemingly an unavoidable fact of life. From an early age, children are sharing resources, observing models, receiving feedback, and negotiating meaning in mediated tasks. Often these early lessons are lost in the increasingly competitive aspects of education. One of the earliest lessons I learned on the inherent values of collaboration, has been extremely beneficial in my own development. My father used an analogy of nails on a board to tell me that there are two ways of achieving success in life: one can either knock in the surrounding nails leaving one's own as the tallest (and thereby assume superiority), or one could help pull up all the nails and thus raise the level of all in the process. While I always remember what he instilled in me, the truth of that statement has been learned through lived experiences of working with others.

REFERENCES

Appley, D. E., & Winder, A. E. (1977). An evolving definition of collaboration and some implications for the world of work. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 13*(3), 279–290.

Avala, G., & Yano, Y. (1994). Decision issues in a collaborative intelligent learning environment for Japanese language patterns. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 388 222).

Barnett, B. G. (1990). School-university collaboration: A fad or the future of administrator preparation? *Planning & Changing, 21*(3), 146–157.

Bembry, J. X. (1995). Project SUCCESS: A model for university-school-community partnerships. *Social Work in Education, 17*(4), 256–262.

Borden, C. A. (1992). Collaboration, for better or worse: Part 4. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization. 14*(1), 133–142.

Brisk, M. E. (1991). Toward multilingual and multicultural mainstream education. *Journal of Education, 173*(2), 114–129.

Brown, A. L., & Ferrara, R. A. (1985). Diagnosing zones of proximal development. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives* (pp. 275–305). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bruner, J. (1983). *In search of mind: Essays in autobiography*. New York: Harper & Row.

Button, K., Ponticell, J., & Johnson, M. J. (1996). Enabling school-university collaborative research: Lessons learned in professional development schools. *Journal of Teacher Education, 47*(1), 16–20.

Campione, J. C., & Brown, A. L. (1987). Linking dynamic assessment with school achievement. In C. S. Lidz (Ed.), *Dynamic assessment: An interactional approach to evaluating learning potential* (pp. 82–115). New York: Guilford Press.

Castaneda, L. V. (1992). Improving programs of schools serving culturally and linguistically diverse student populations. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 358 212).

Catelli, L. A. (1995). Action research and collaborative inquiry in a school-university partnership. *Action in Teacher Education, 16*(4), 25–38.

Cavanaugh, M. P. (1993). Collaboration: A link between the high school and the university. *The Clearing House*, 66(6), 335–338.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Corey, S. (1953). *Action research to improve school practices.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Crookes, G. (1993). Action research for second language teachers: Going beyond teacher research. *Applied Linguistics, 14*(2), 130–144.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 18–35.

DeBevoise, W. (1986). Collaboration: Some principles of bridgework. *Educational Leadership, 43*(5), 9–12.

Dubetz, N. E. (1995). Models of collaboration among ESOL, bilingual, and mainstream teachers. *New York State TESOL Publication* 51–58.

Ebbut, D. (1985). Educational action research: Some general concerns and specific quibbles. In R. Burgess (Ed.), *Issues in educational research: Qualitative methods* (pp. 152–174). Philadelphia, PA: Lewes Falmer Press.

Elliot, A. E. (1985). Moving from "two solitudes" towards a "blended" culture in school/university partnerships. *The Journal of Staff, Program & Organizational Development, 13*(2), 85.

Elliot, J. (1977). Developing hypothesis about classrooms from teachers' practical constructs: An account of the work of the Ford Teaching Project. *Interchange, 7*(2), 2–21.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition.* Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Erickson, F. (1989). Research currents: Learning and collaboration in teaching. *Language Arts*, 66(4), 430–441.

Fischer, M. M. J., & Abedi, M. (1990). Debating Muslims: Cultural dialogues in postmodernity and tradition. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Fox, D. J. (1969). *The research process in education.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Fox, M. F., & Faver, C. A. (1984). Independence and cooperation in research: The motivations and costs of collaboration. *Journal of Higher Education*, 55(3), 347-359.

Freeman, D. (1982). Observing teachers: three approaches to in-service training and development. *TESOL Quarterly*, *16*(1), 21–28.

Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages: Studies of immersion and bilingual education*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Green, N., Baldini, B., & Stack, W. M. (1993). Spanning cultures: Teachers and professors in professional development schools. *Action in Teacher Education*, *15*(2), 18–24.

Griffin, G. A., Lieberman, A., & Jacullo-Noto, J. (1982). *Interactive research and development on schooling: Final report*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Goodlad, J. I. (1993). School-university partnerships and partner schools. *Educational Policy*, *7*, 24–39.

Hasbach, C. (1992). Holistic literacy: Voices integrating classroom texts in social studies. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 098).

Hawkinson, A. (1992, November). *When seeing is believing, and believing is learning: A new look at classroom observation*. Presentation given at JALT, 1992, Kawagoe, Japan.

Henze, R., & Vanett, L. (1993). To walk in two worlds — or more? Challenging a common metaphor of native education. *Anthropology and Education*, *24*(2), 116–134.

Hodgkinson, H. L. (1957). Action research: A critique. *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, *31*(4), 137–153.

Hoffman, D. (1989). Language and culture acquisition among Iranians in the United States. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, *20*(2), 118- 132.

Holly, P. (1991). Action research: The missing link in the creation of schools as centers of inquiry. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.), *Staff development for education in the 90's* (pp. 133–157). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hord, S. M. (1985). Collaboration or cooperation: Comparisons and contrasts, dilemmas and decisions. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 258 356).

Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1979). Micro- and macro-developmental changes in language acquisition and other representational systems. *Cognitive Science*. *3*, 91–118.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. Hong Kong: Longman.

Lieberman, A. (1986). Collaborative research: Working with, not working on *Educational Leadership*, *43*(45), 28–32.

Lo Bianco, J. (1990). Making language policy: Australia's experience. In R. Baldauf & A. Luke (Eds.), *Language planning and education in Australia and the South Pacific* (pp. 47–79). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60(3), 315–340.

Malo, D. (1951). *Hawaiian antiquities*. Honolulu, HI: Bishop Museum Press.

Metzner, S. (1970). School-university partnership: A tale of dichotomous desires. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 51(6), 329–329.

Noddings, N. (1986). Fidelity in teaching, teacher education, and research for teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 496–510.

Nunan, D. (Ed.). (1992). *Collaborative language learning and teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oberg, A. A., & McCutcheon, G. (1990). This issue. *Theory Into Practice*. 29(3), 142- 143.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Patterson, L., & Shannon, P. (1993). Reflection, inquiry, action. In L. Patterson, C. M. Santa, K. G. Short, & K. Smith (Eds.), *Teachers are researchers: Reflection and action* (pp. 7–11). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Pine, G. (1979). Collaborative action research: Teacher emancipation. *New England Teacher Corps Exchange*, 2(1), 7–8.

Pine, G. (1986). Collaborative action research and staff development in the middle school. *Middle School Journal*, 18(1), 33–35.

Purkey, W. (1970). *Self concept and school achievement*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rosaen, C. L. (1992). Integration from the student perspective: Constructing meaning in a writers' workshop. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 061).

Rosaldo, R. (1989). *Culture and Truth: The remaking of social analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Sanford, N. (1970). Whatever happened to action research? *Journal of Social Issues*, 26(4), 3–23.

Schmidt, R. (Ed.), (1995). *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning*. (Technical Report #15). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Sirotnik, K. (1988). The meaning and conduct of inquiry in school-university partnerships. In K. Sirotnik & J. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns* (pp. 169–190). New York: Teachers College Press.

Stopes-Roe, M., & Cochrane, R. (1990). *Citizens of this country: The Asian-British*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Syed, Z. (1997). *Notions of self in foreign language learning. A qualitative analysis*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Tikunoff, W., & Ward, B. A. (1983). Collaborative research on teaching. *The Elementary School Journal, 83*, 453–468.

Tonkin, H. (1981). The World in the curriculum: Curricular strategies for the 21st century. Education and world view, II. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED211009).

Trist, E. (1977). Collaboration in work settings: A personal perspective. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 13*(3), 268–278.

Trueba, H. T. (Ed.). (1987). *Success or failure: Learning and language minority student.* New York: Newbury House.

Trueba, H. T. (1989). *Raising silent voices: Educating the linguistic minorities for the 21st century.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Tudoe, J. (1990). Collaborative problem solving in the zone of proximal development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 324 140).

van Loenen, R., & Haley, P. K. (1994). Consultation and collaboration: English as a second language and regular classroom teachers working together. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372 645).

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wenden, A. L., & Rubin, J. (Eds.). (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning.* Englewood, Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wertsch, J. V. (1979). From social interaction to higher psychological process. *Human Development, 22*, 1–22.

Whitford, B. L., Schlechty, P. C., & Shelor, L. G. (1987). Sustaining action research through collaboration: Inquiries for invention. *Peabody Journal of Education, 64*(3), 151–169.

Wilbur, F., & Lambert, L. (1991). *Linking America's schools and colleges.* Washington, DC: AAHE.

Williamson, K., Gloadon, I., & Hutchinson, G. (1990). Second wind: A university based in-service program that empowers public school teachers to define projects and implement change in their programs. *Strategies, 4*(2), 14–18.

PART II

COMMUNITY LANGUAGE AS RESOURCE

Ann Shonle
Newcomer Pathways, Boulder Valley School District, Colorado
Megan Thompson Rolland
Viewpoint School, Calabasas, California

THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PARTNERSHIP PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

Hawai'i is home to a diverse population, many of whom are recent immigrants or second, third, fourth, and even fifth generation Filipinos, Japanese, Chinese, Pacific Islanders, and other ethnicities. More recent immigrants are from the Philippines, Pacific Islands, and South and Central America. These immigrant groups often form active communities that support churches and other institutions in which their language is spoken. However, many local-born individuals no longer speak their heritage language, but would like to learn and actively use this language. Japanese is generally taught in the public schools, but those wishing to learn Filipino and Pacific Island languages must wait until they attend the university where courses in these languages are offered. Most of the students enrolled in these language courses at the University of Hawai'i indeed come from family backgrounds where the language is or was spoken. This situation provides for an excellent match between the language resources of the immigrant students and their communities on the one hand, and the needs of the English-speakers who wish to learn those languages, on the other. The Foreign Language Partnership Project described here offers ways in which teachers can utilize the language resources of immigrant communities while teaching heritage/foreign languages.

The Foreign Language Partnership Project involved hiring and training "at risk" high school students, who are native speakers of languages taught at the university, to provide tutoring for university foreign language students. By focusing on communicative language use, the "at-risk" high school students supplemented and enriched university foreign language instruction by providing one-on-one and small group tutoring (at no cost to the university students) as well as occasional target language experiences such as immigrant community/family events. The goal was to give university students the opportunity to improve foreign language fluency through drawing on the natural language and cultural resources of the high school students. It was also hoped that giving the high school students increased responsibility and paying them for their valuable services would serve to facilitate appreciation of their own bilingualism, improve their overall linguistic and metalinguistic skills, and increase their self-esteem.

Shonle, A., & Thompson Rolland, M. (1999). The Foreign Language Partnership Project. In K. A. Davis (Ed.), *Foreign language teaching and language minority education*. (Technical Report pp. 85–104). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

In order to document the problems and potential of Foreign Language Partnerships, we conducted an ongoing evaluation of the project during the two years (1994–1996) that it took place. This qualitative research component of the project included interviews, participant observation, and document collection. To investigate the degree and forms of language learning, the sessions were audio-taped and selected tapes were transcribed, translated, and analyzed. In addition, some sessions were observed by the researchers and/or video-taped. Interviews of participants and instructors focused on gaining an understanding of language, educational, and cultural attitudes as well as the language learning experience itself. Formal interviews were scheduled with participants near the beginning of the tutoring sessions each semester and after the semester's sessions were over. Informal interaction with participants took place throughout the tutoring. Participants were also asked to keep a journal of their language and social experiences. There was no opportunity to interview the high school tutors' teachers, but questionnaires were completed by several teachers identified by the tutors. In addition, evaluation forms were distributed to the tutees.

The data collected over the two years were analyzed by the research team. Interviews, field notes, and journals were analyzed for themes; these themes became the focus of further interviews and observations in the cyclical data analysis process of qualitative research (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). Triangulation, or ensuring credibility and dependability of the data and analysis, was achieved by comparing the various sources of data (interviews, observations, journals) (Davis, 1995). Participants were informed of the nature of the research, and consent was obtained from all participants. Names of participants have been changed to protect privacy. The following descriptions, based on the data collected and analyzed, portray the problems and potential of the Foreign Language Partnership Project.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

As the Foreign Language Partnership Project has only existed as a pilot program thus far, it has been rather small scale. In the 1994–1995 academic year, five native speakers of Ilokano and Tagalog from a Honolulu area high school tutored five university students. In the 1995–1996 academic year, the tutor-tutee ratio was increased in the interests of serving more university students and promoting more interaction: four native speakers of Ilokano and two Samoan native speakers from the same school tutored eleven university students.[1]

TUTOR SELECTION AND TRAINING

The high school tutors were selected with the help of a high school ESL teacher and the university language instructors. Interested students took part in an informal

[1] The demand for tutoring was overwhelming and we were only able to accommodate a small fraction of interested university students. In addition, other high school students expressed interest in teaching their languages to university students. Clearly this program was filling a need on both sides.

native language proficiency assessment and were interviewed in order to determine their native language proficiency level. The high school ESL teacher participated in the interviewing process and was especially helpful since she was familiar with the students and speaks both Tagalog and Ilokano. University instructors were also encouraged to provide questions or materials for interviews which they felt would be helpful in the selection process.

Once the tutors were selected, the research team conducted informal interviews with these students to determine their reasons for accepting the tutoring position. For the most part, tutors stated that they wanted to help other people learn their language and they wanted the teaching experience. They felt lucky to be chosen to work as tutors. June says

> I was supposed to [have another job], but when I heard about this job, then just forget about that. [It was] McDonalds. Cause I, like, heard about this job. I say, oh, I like this one better than that. And my friend, she's telling me, oh, over there [McDonalds] get more money. And I say I don't go for money, I go for um, XX teach people my language, like, I like them to know, to learn.

Responses such as the one above indicate that the tutors shared a principal goal of the project, that of improving language skills of university students. Tutors also saw some of the other intangible benefits they could receive from the program in terms of the experience they would gain, the pride they felt in sharing their language, and what they would learn from it. For example, Analyn says, "To me it's like a very big experience for like, tutoring other people, and even me, I learn a lot from tutoring, not only what I teaching, yeah, I learn too."

Although money was not the primary motivation for participation in the program, it was clear that receiving a salary was part of the continued motivation to meet tutees on a regular basis. When asked if they would still be interested in tutoring if they were not paid, some tutors said they would, but other said they would only if they were not too busy. From the point of view of the program's goals, however, paying the tutors for their services had an even more important role: that of valuing their language skills.[2]

Tutors also indicated during preliminary interviews that they were surprised to be asked to teach college students and some doubted their own abilities to do so. June's

[2] There are certainly methods for valuing students language skills other than paying them a salary. For example, students could be given high school course credit for preparing and implementing tutoring curriculum. Course credit would be especially feasible through offering courses in students' native languages, one course for native speaking students (e.g., Ilokano for Ilokano speakers) and one foreign language course (e.g., in Ilokano). Part of the native language speakers course requirements could involve tutoring the foreign language students. Not only would this arrangement provide conversational partners for the foreign language students, but the native language speakers would most likely receive recognition at school for their language skills, thus, helping to counter the low "deficiency" status that immigrants usually experience. In addition, immigrants would be provided with the opportunity to strengthen their native language and literacy skills.

observations represent the fears of all of the tutors as well as their relief that they would receive special training for the job.

> She [project coordinator] was telling me about the job, if I want to teach, I was, kind of like, what? What do you mean teach, I didn't even grad[uate] and you're telling me...And she said, no, if I want to help the, the college students for teaching them my language...I asked her how old are they...I thought they were younger than me. When I found out it's gonna be at UH (University of Hawai'i)...I was like, UH, oh yeah, that's the college. It's kind of scary, cause they're older than me, so I don't wanna go teach there. But now I think get used to it, the training, then makes me- helps me, it help me for get used to.

Tutors were not alone in their initial lack of confidence in themselves. While some parents were doubtful that high school students could teach at the university level, they were proud that their children had been selected for the project. Marissa states

> Um, my parents are happy too [that she's in the program] because I'm teaching students from UH, but sometimes they challenge me, like are you able to do it, to teach it well...cause they was like, students from UH, they was like, you don't know how to teach them cause they're more like, better than you. But my parents, they just proud.

The next step after the selection process and initial interviews was to prepare the high school students for tutoring. Training sessions for selected tutors were conducted over a four week period just prior to the beginning of the university Fall term. The trainers and tutors met twice a week for an hour and a half and the tutors were paid for the time spent in the sessions. The goals for the training were to help the tutors gain metalinguistic awareness of their language as well as basic knowledge of sociolinguistics, foreign language teaching, tutoring techniques and strategies, and lesson planning. The trainers used a variety of activities, including lectures and discussions, analysis of authentic language, viewing videos about tutoring, and brainstorming for topics and activities for the tutoring sessions. Although the training provided an opportunity to develop lesson plans, tutors were given primary responsibility for determining the activities of each tutoring session. Tutors had access to a variety of materials, such as dictionaries, stories, maps, and non-language-specific language tasks/games such as *Spot the Difference* pictures and *Picture Story Sequences*. Tutors were also encouraged to utilize any authentic materials they had, such as magazines, tapes, or videos. However, trainers were always available for consultation and ongoing trainer observations, video-taping, and/or tape recording insured high quality instruction and interaction. In addition, halfway through the school year before the spring tutoring sessions began, a two-hour workshop was held so that the tutors could reflect on the previous semester's tutoring and discuss ways to improve class sessions for the upcoming semester. In the second year of the program, just after the fall tutoring had started, we arranged a meeting with the previous tutors and the current tutors so that they could share their experiences with each other and with us.

TUTEE SELECTION

The university students who were tutored, referred to as tutees, were selected in consultation with the university language instructors at the beginning of Fall semester. In the case of Ilokano and Tagalog, the program coordinators visited each first and second year class to explain the program and distribute a questionnaire which was primarily used to determine level of interest in participating in the program. The university students were informed of the nature of the program and the accompanying research component. Once all the questionnaires had been collected, the university language instructors reviewed them with the coordinators, indicating students they thought could especially benefit from the extra help. For the second year of the project, we initially attempted to pair a more advanced student with a student who was struggling, but this proved to be logistically difficult and the idea was abandoned. However, due to the demand for tutoring among university students, we decided that each tutor would work with two tutees, as opposed to the first year when each tutor worked with one tutee. As there were four Ilokano tutors the second year, we decided to have two first-year groups and two second year groups. In addition to university instructors' recommendations, we gave priority to tutees who expressed the most interest in participating for the opportunity to speak with a native speaker, as opposed to the opportunity to improve their grade or receive extra credit. From this pool, eight tutees were selected and meeting times/days were arranged. For the Samoan tutoring, the university Samoan instructor wanted to have his entire third year class participate (five students). However, this proved not to be feasible due to the university students' schedules, and in the end, one Samoan group with two tutees and two tutors was formed.

Prior to the beginning of the tutoring, the tutees were interviewed by the research team to gain a better understanding of their reasons for choosing the particular language they did for meeting the foreign language requirement. We discovered that the majority of these students and, indeed, those studying Ilokano or Tagalog at the university, are second or third generation Filipinos who are attempting to regain the language and culture they had lost through a monolingual English education. For example, Jonalynn stated, "I thought it was a shame that I did not know how to speak my (heritage) language (Ilokano)," and Katheena said, "Unfortunately, I am not fluent in Ilokano and that's a loss to me because that is a loss of my culture." Because of these clear indications of immigrant struggles with cultural identity, two members of the research team decided to conduct an in-depth literature review and qualitative study of this aspect of the project (see Syed and Burnett and Burnett and Syed, this volume).

PROJECT EVALUATION

TUTORING SESSIONS: OVERVIEW

The tutoring sessions generally were held twice a week for between one and one and a half hours for each session, depending on the schedule worked out by the tutors

and tutees. The high school tutors traveled to the university after their school day was over. Although tutors and tutees usually met at the university in a classroom reserved for project use, sometimes the groups chose to meet in the university students' dorm rooms or a campus restaurant. On one or two occasions per semester tutors and tutees met in Filipino or Samoan homes or community establishments such as restaurants. However, the practice of holding most of the tutoring sessions on campus in the afternoons created logistical problems. The university students were often on tight schedules due to working while attending classes and voiced concerns about the late afternoon timing of the tutoring sessions.[3] The university students suggested that the tutoring sessions be scheduled as "lab classes." This indeed would allow university students to receive course credit and, thus, carry a full load of courses needed for bureaucratic reasons or to meet requirements for financial aid. In addition, the tuition paid for a tutoring lab could be used as salary for tutors. Another logistical problem involved transportation for tutors between the high school and the university. Although the tutors were extremely reliable about coming to the university for tutoring sessions, they reported that it was quite an onerous and expensive endeavor since there were several bus connections to make. We felt that, in the future, either more suitable transportation would need to be arranged and budgeted for or independent partnerships would need to be formed at the university and high school.

Before the beginning of the tutoring sessions, all of the tutors, tutees, university instructors, and program coordinators met in an informal social event to review the nature of the program and get to know each other in a relaxed setting. Nonetheless, tutors tended to be somewhat nervous before they started as well as during the initial tutoring sessions. Some of the tutors did not know quite what to expect, even after the training session. However, the tutors soon became accustomed to their teaching roles. Marissa observed

> ...I expect to, like I have to teach them, like you know how the teacher teach, you know like you have to teach them formally like...I don't know what I'm gonna do, because they just listen, they just listen what I'm gonna say, like that. They not speaking anything, like that's all...now what's the next thing to say...and I got stuck, I feel ashamed...In the beginning it was harder, then just after like two sessions like that, it's easier.

The tutors recognition of their own language skills also bolstered their confidence, as most tutors felt they knew enough about their language to teach it. Shelly observes, "[I worry that] I may run out of English [to explain her assignments]. I hope I don't run out of Tagalog. I'm not concerned anymore [with my ability to work as a Tagalog tutor] because this is my first language."

[3] Despite the inconvenience of afternoon scheduling, the university students faithfully attended sessions.

In addition to becoming more comfortable with their roles after a session or two, tutors generally reported feeling both more confident and competent the second semester that they worked. Marissa states

> [Second semester was better], maybe because of our activities, and she [her tutee] is really interested in knowing and questioning, it's like she's open in questioning to me, and the activities are more better the second time because in the first time, we're still just beginning like that, and we still don't know what to do, so we don't know what interest them. Maybe, because my first time, my first semester, they so bored because we just read and read, or I have them vocabs like that, it's better for second semester.

Tutors felt that having experience and practice helped them to be better tutors. In fact, we noted that although the tutors were initially shy and awkward during first meetings, they became increasingly self-confident and professional during the academic year.

The tutoring sessions generally involved working on the university students' homework or engaging in activities which were interesting and meaningful to the tutees. Homework from the university language classes tended to consist of grammar exercises, translation of stories and dialogues, speaking and pronunciation practice, and vocabulary memorization. Additional authentic materials were used by tutors such as in listening to, translating, and/or singing songs, watching and discussing movies, and reading and discussing magazines, comics, and serial novels. In addition, materials such as photos provided the impetus for conversation or a framework for communicative language activities such as *Spot the Difference* and *Picture Story Sequences*. Since many of the Filipino tutors and tutees have relatives in the Philippines, some of the participants exchanged letters in Ilokano or Tagalog with relatives. Other activities centered around culture, such as dancing (the Samoan groups) and talking about traditional holidays. Several times groups sought out situations where they could use the target language, such as at Filipino restaurants as described by Cindy:

> We decided to go and eat some Filipino food with [another tutoring group]. We ride on my tutee's car though Kalihi. We ate at Jesse's Filipino restaurant. We were talking in Tagalog. We decided to talk in Tagalog so they [the tutees] can practice. They also ordered by themselves in Tagalog way.

Tutees also occasionally interacted with their tutor's family members using the target language. Shelly tells us, "Later, she [her tutee] called my grandmother. She called my home. And, my grandmother said [her tutee] was speaking in Tagalog even if this was broken Tagalog...My grandma said she was a pleasant person to talk to. So my grandma matched her words with her level." In addition, Marissa was resourceful enough to teach her tutee a traditional craft (weaving baskets out of paper) and several tutors introduced Filipino games to their tutees. Finally, a favorite activity for tutors and tutees was gossiping — in the target language.

The tutors were able to fill the role of peers in conversation and even their families at times served as native speaker interlocutors. These connections with the target language community provided both language/cultural experiences and the possibility of future interaction within the community for the tutee. In these settings, the tutors were the expert guides, helping the tutees negotiate their way through. Drawing on the community resources in this way relates to Moll's (1992) notion of "funds of knowledge," in which communities are looked at in terms of the skills and resources they possess, not in terms of what they lack. In introducing tutees to their personal and community resources, tutors validated these resources and exposed their tutees to potentially valuable aides to their language learning.

SECOND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

It is difficult to show evidence of language acquisition without conducting pretests and having very specific criteria. It is even more difficult to prove that language acquisition has been the result of some specific input or treatment; this would require a highly controlled experimental design of the kind that is difficult to carry out in an ongoing program in which students have access to input outside the classroom. The FLPP did not include language pretests nor was it intended to be a highly controlled experimental design. The intention for analysis of language learning in this project was not to quantify language acquisition or to establish causality, but to examine the tutoring sessions for some of the indirect measures that are thought to lead to language development. We included qualitative analysis of observations and interviews conducted with university students, their tutors, and university language instructors regarding participants' progress in the target language.

Second language acquisition and interaction

Comprehensible input is generally accepted in the field as being a necessary part of language acquisition. Some even go as far as to say that comprehensible input is the only necessary condition for language acquisition, citing cases of people who apparently learned a language perfectly without ever producing it (e.g., Krashen, 1985). However, a more tempered view, one formulated in the light of other research findings, proposes that comprehensible output (i.e., language production) and interaction in the target language are facilitative, if not necessary (e.g., Long, 1996). One of the lines of research leading to this hypothesis is assessments of the French language skills of English-speaking French immersion students. These students generally were not achieving native-like production norms in spite of having access to a great deal of comprehensible input (e.g., Swain, 1985). In contrast, a seminal article on discourse analysis and SLA by Hatch (1978) suggests that syntax develops out of interactions with more proficient speakers.

The emphasis on input has led to discussion over input modification or ways to alter the input to make it more comprehensible to the language learner. There are two ways that input can be modified (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Long, 1983). The input itself can be modified in advance (pre-modified input) or by proficient

speakers when they talk to learners (i.e., Foreigner Talk) in terms of phonology (i.e., slower rate of delivery, more careful articulation, etc.), in terms of morphology and syntax (i.e., shorter utterances, more regularity, more overt marking of grammatical relations, etc.), and in terms of semantics (i.e., fewer idiomatic expressions, use of high frequency nouns and verbs, etc.). Input can also be modified in interaction by the speakers in terms of topic and of interactional structure. For example, the FLPP tutee, Anna, suggested the following about her interaction with a native speaker tutor:

> I feel like yeah [more confident about Ilokano], cause like when we speak, Lyn and I, and like she [Lyn, the tutor] will go real slowly, but in class our teacher goes really fast, you know, you can't get like every other word, and you just kind of go, 'Oh, OK'...but Lyn will go real slow and if I don't understand, like if I go 'What is that word,' instead of telling me the definition, she will like explain or she will make an analogy in Ilokano and then I'll go, I will kind of like you know guess and then I learn that way.

As appears here, negotiation of meaning, or the "modification and restructuring of interaction that occurs when learners and their interlocutors anticipate, perceive, or experience difficulties in message comprehensibility" (Pica, 1994, p. 494), is most likely more facilitative of SLA than linguistically pre-modified input or Foreigner Talk (Long, 1996). Negotiation can occur during normal communication (i.e., not a drill or other such exercise) between proficient speakers, between more proficient and less proficient speakers, or between less proficient speakers. In the case of the FLPP, the focus is on interactions between less proficient speakers (the university students) and more proficient speakers (the high school students).[4] With conversationally negotiated input, the interlocutor can be exposed to "normal" input and then negotiate the meaning of those features of the conversation which are causing difficulty at the time when the difficulty occurs. Merely pre-modifying materials (i.e., making them simpler or giving them characteristics of interactionally modified input but not allowing interaction) does not always provide the same levels of comprehensibility or success in later language production as does interactionally modified input (Gass & Varonis, 1994; Long, 1996). It also may not provide learners with exposure to the very features of the language which they need to learn. For example, the FLPP tutees mentioned learning language that was never taught in the classroom. Vanessa states that "...[the tutor] taught me part of the body. We never learned that [in Ilokano class]...she taught me words I didn't learn in class yet." Jennie reveals that, in the course of her tutoring sessions

> ...we went to...a Filipino restaurant, you know, so I didn't have to write or anything, we were just talking and when she [her tutor] mentioned a vocabulary [that I didn't know and wanted to know], I go [to her], 'Wait, let me put this in the computer (she brings a laptop computer to the tutoring sessions)...OK, what did

[4] The use of the common terms Non-Native Speaker (NNS) and Native Speaker (NS) will be avoided, as many learners and interlocutors do not fit exactly into these categories, and it is misleading to think that only the Native Speaker can take the role of the more proficient speaker.

> you say now, OK, OK'...then [we start] eat[ing], then 'OK let me do that again' [putting more vocabulary words into the computer], then we record our, you know, it was like the vocabulary that I needed to know and I felt that was important, I record it in the computer.

Students were not simply learning new vocabulary in tutoring sessions; they were learning the vocabulary they needed for real conversation in actual social situations.

To gain an understanding of the impact the tutoring sessions might have on second language development in light of current SLA theories, we investigated the degree to which much of the tutoring sessions were spent in meaningful interaction in the target language. Meaningful interaction was defined as conversation about matters of personal interest to the participants, discussion of a metalinguistic nature, engaging in literacy events of a personal nature (i.e., journals or letters), and administrative discussion (i.e., where and when to meet next). Based on a rough analysis of transcripts of the first year of the program, we saw that, in general, the participants were engaged in meaningful interaction for at least half the sessions and, as the semester went on, most sessions consisted almost entirely of meaningful interaction. Within these periods of meaningful interaction, the tutees used the target language more and more often so that by the end of the semester they were using the target language for half or more of the meaningful interactions. Of course, there were differences between groups; some groups used the TL or engaged in meaningful interaction more than other groups. In general, tutors reported that it was easier to work with students who were a little more advanced in their studies, that is, either second year or second semester students.

Based on university tutees' comments during interviews and in their journals, the differences between university classes and the tutoring sessions were further explored. A first and obvious point of comparison is that of student to teacher ratio. The university classes for these languages tend to be quite large, ranging from 25 to 35 students. This has been especially true in the last year or so due to budget cuts and the commitment of the university instructors to provide language instruction for all interested students regardless of the number of sections offered. In contrast, because the tutoring sessions consisted of one high school tutor and one or two university tutees, each tutee spent much more time in direct interaction in the tutoring sessions than in their university classes. In discussing the benefits of the FLPP, one tutee states, "That's [conversational Ilokano] my real goal....[One of the most useful activities was being able to]...express yourself in the language cause sometimes it's difficult, yeah, even now I think it's something that you have to do everyday cause then it's hard to learn the language just by going to class."

We also found some differences in types of teaching/learning activities between the university classes and the tutoring sessions. We were not able to collect interactional data in all of the university language classes and, in any case, it would not have been possible to get interactional data on each student during group and pair work. However, observations and recordings of several classes indicated that they typically ranged from having no opportunity for students to engage in

meaningful interaction and negotiation for meaning to approximately half of the class being spent in some form of meaningful exchange. During these meaningful exchanges, the format most often involved one or two students interacting with the instructor with only occasional group or pair work. University classes also usually contained at least some portion of explicit presentation of grammar rules and drills. Michelle reports that

> ...in class we don't speak it [Ilokano] really. She [the UH instructor] speaks to us and we learn words and stuff but we don't speak in class to her. Well, we do, but we do it from the exercise (grammar/structured exercise from the textbook). You know what I mean, it is not natural [language use]. And like, I don't know, some things you just have to learn outside of the class.

Although tutoring sessions typically contained meaningful exchanges, the tutoring sessions were sometimes spent in going over university class homework. In this way, the tutors were able to help their tutees understand class work and clarify grammatical structures or reading passages. The tutors usually showed sensitivity to the difficulties of language learning.

> ...even if the teacher and whoever else teach like the book, yeah, the explanation, I still have a difficult time understanding things. And then I guess maybe the tutors they [are] more of my level, you know, like even if they're more advanced in Filipino and stuff, they know how to explain it more. And in a way that I can understand or better remember and stuff, yeah...[The tutoring] prepares me for my exams and stuff. Or like after my exams if I had an error, you know, I always ask the tutor 'Oh, what went wrong, what did I do wrong,' you know, and then they explain it. And [I] always gotta ask 'Why, is it this way,' and they explain it, you know. So I can kinda grasp on it a little longer than I would normally, you know, without the tutoring. (Sarah)

> I like the tutoring session because it allows me to put aside time devoted specifically to study Ilokano. And I can study with someone who knows the language and can help me and explain. If I study alone, I have to figure things out myself, which is hard...because I don't know that much. (Roxanne)

The students suggested additional ways the tutoring helped overcome individual difficulties. For example, for some people, trying to speak a second language in front of a group can be an uncomfortable experience. Having a few people who have some experience with the target language in the same room can add more anxiety to the beginning second language learner.

> My class, they are intimidating. In a sense where most of them [the other students] are I think fluent, they understand. I am just starting from scratch, and that's the hard thing...I'm like...the teacher takes it at a faster pace I guess because all of the people understand and there are just a few of us who don't...(Celia)

> ...I feel kinda shame to talk sometimes cause it'll sound funny or I'm saying things wrong or I'm pronouncing things wrong. So that's one thing that kinda holds me back. So the tutoring is helping me get over that little bit. (John)

> [When spoken in Ilokano] I would answer back in English, I would in Ilokano too. But um I guess it made me feel more comfortable with the language. Because I would feel funny talking in Ilokano. And then as um I went to the tutoring sessions that I got more used to it seemed more natural to speak Ilokano. (Cindy)

The non-intimidating atmosphere of the tutoring sessions along with one-on-one practice in speaking helped students gain both the fluency and confidence needed to communicate in both classroom and community settings.

Interactional moves that facilitate acquisition

Negotiation of meaning during interaction can be initiated by either the learner or by the more proficient speaker. Earlier research tended to focus on moves made by the more proficient speaker that either indicated there was a problem, attempted to repair the problem, or to confirm comprehension. These moves are generally thought to make the input the learner receives more comprehensible and, thus, more conducive to intake and acquisition (Long, 1996). The moves made by speakers more proficient than their interlocutors have been referred to as confirmation checks, comprehension checks, and requests for clarification (see, e.g., Long, 1983). *Confirmation checks* are "expressions by the native speaker immediately following an utterance by the interlocutor which are designed to elicit confirmation that the utterance has been correctly heard or understood by the speaker" (Long, 1983, p. 137). They involve repeating all or part of the other's preceding utterance and generally take the form of rising intonation questions (in English; they may take a different form in other languages). *Comprehension checks* are a way for the native speaker to check whether the non-native speaker has understood something; they take the form of questions such as *OK?* and *Do you understand? Requests for clarification* are expressions by the more proficient speaker requesting that the learner clarify the preceding utterance.

More recently, however, researchers have recognized that moves made by the learner that signal a breakdown in communication are also important and have referred to all such moves as signals (Pica, 1994). Such signals are triggered by a problem in communication and are generally followed by some modification of the problem utterance which facilitates comprehension such as repetition, reformulation, or segmentation. In fact, signals initiated by the learner may be more valuable than signals initiated by the more proficient speaker because the learner is more involved in the action and may be psycholinguistically more able to turn the input into intake (Ortega, personal communication, Rabie, 1996).

Negative feedback, or interactional moves that contain explicit or implicit information to the effect that the non-native speaker has said something incorrectly or has generalized a rule incorrectly, has been proposed as facilitative of language

acquisition because it enhances attention to language form in the context of meaningful communication (Long, 1996). Negative feedback can take the form of explicit, implicit, preemptive, or reactive feedback. In particular, Long argues that *recasts*, a type of reactive implicit negative feedback, in which a learner's utterance is formulated but the semantic meaning remains constant, are an especially useful form of negative feedback. In the case of recasts, the semantic meaning is already clear to the language learner so attention can be focused on the form of the utterance.

The tutoring sessions were analyzed for recasts, confirmation checks, requests for clarification, comprehension checks, and repetition. However, a caveat is in order: the results are reported here as trends rather than statistics since the quality of the transcriptions was not uniform and the analyzer of the data does not speak Tagalog, Ilokano, or Samoan and so used translations.

The data suggests that some interactional moves made by the tutee could be beneficial in negotiation for meaning and for language acquisition. For example, several tutees used the strategy of repeating, with a questioning intonation, a word or phrase that they did not understand in order to indicate non-comprehension; the tutor generally understood the repetition as such and provided either a definition, a paraphrase, or a translation. In fact, the traditional comprehension check on the part of the more proficient speaker did not occur in this data. Another potentially valuable interactional move on the part of the tutees was to check their own comprehension of something the tutor had said by translating it into English with a questioning intonation. In terms of traditional categories, recasts were the most common interactional move; they occurred in almost every session. Approximately half of the recasts were incorporated. Incorporation of recasts is defined here as being used correctly or repeated by the tutee within five turns after the recast. Requests for clarification were the next most common move, although they occurred much less frequently. Confirmation checks were rare and, as mentioned, comprehension checks on the part of the tutor did not occur. Repetition proved to be difficult to determine since it had different functions, such as when the tutee repeated a phrase to indicate non-comprehension then either the tutee would repeat the tutor's recast or the tutor would confirm what the tutee had said. Although there were several other instances in which it seemed that there was mutual construction of meaning, the moves did not fit into traditional categories. Later sessions generally contained more interactional moves than early sessions, indicating that there was more negotiation for meaning as the semester progressed, perhaps either because the participants felt more comfortable with each other or because there was more meaningful exchange in the TL in later sessions.

In addition to the importance of interaction and negotiation for meaning in second language acquisition, Schachter suggests that metalinguistic awareness, in the form of information about what is possible and what is not possible in the target language, is important in the development of the proper constraints on a learner's second language grammar (Schachter, 1986). Data analysis revealed that there was

discussion of a metalinguistic nature in most FLPP sessions regarding the form of the language (mostly morphology) as well as sociolinguistic usage.

Another way that interaction is thought to facilitate SLA is through second language learners noticing a linguistic problem and, thus, pushing themselves to modify their output (Swain & Lapkin, 1995). In other words, noticing allows learners to pay attention to the form of the target language. Noticing has been proposed as a necessary condition for SLA (Schmidt, 1993) and interaction is thought to provide opportunities for noticing, especially when breakdowns occur. This can lead to syntactical as well as lexical development. In several studies conducted by Pica and her colleagues (Pica, Lewis, & Morganthale 1989, 1991; cited in Pica, 1994), many negotiations involved structural changes, such as segmentation or relocating a portion of an utterance to a more prominent position. These structural changes, thus, provided the learner with the opportunity to focus on form. Although the FLPP data could not practically be analyzed for syntactical and lexical development based on interactions, reports from participants indicated that they believed that this did indeed occur. For example, students generally reported improved understanding of grammar and the ability to incorporate this understanding into their speaking and writing, such as Jennie who reports

> I do [have improved in speaking], because in the beginning I did not know much about structure, about grammar maybe a little, but then when I spoke to my tutor, she...would always correct me, so right now I'm doing better with my pronouns...I can speak better because now when I talk to my parents, not too many pauses as much as before. And lots of new vocab[ulary words]. And writing too, it gets easier.

Other ways that input is made more comprehensible through interaction, such as topic-comment structures and conversational pace, could not be analyzed due to the lack of baseline data on native speaker norms in the three languages involved (Ilokano, Tagalog, Samoan). The lack of baseline data also precludes examination of linguistic modification of input. In any case, input modification itself did not seem to be as helpful as interactional modification.

In addition to language development, students reported that their general language skills improved in a number of ways. Whereas they initially found it difficult to comprehend a foreign language, the tutoring sessions helped increase listening comprehension. After a few weeks of tutoring, Lisa reported, "I am understanding more now...before when Ms. T (the Ilokano professor at the university) used to speak in class, I used to just drift away, I'd never listen, I just did my own thing, and now I am trying to listen [in class] to pick up things and I am beginning to pick it [Ilokano] up." Celia suggested that her pronunciation improved: "...from the tutoring I think I hear the language more often and I try to mimic it in a way." Michelle talked about getting help with both pronunciation and with spelling.

> ...she [my tutor] helps me to pronounce words correctly. That is what we have trouble doing in class. I notice that a lot of people in my class, they have trouble pronouncing the words. Because it is different than the English. And she helps me

> to spell it correctly, because I spell a lot wrong. So that is good. And when I talk to her I just listen to the way that she talks and try to uh cause they [Ilokano speakers] have a different accent than English so I try to do that.

In addition to the language development of the tutees, a side benefit of the program was that the tutors' language skills appeared to increase, in both their own language and in English. In the case of their native language, tutors developed metalinguistic awareness of grammar rules and the semantics of the language. Candy says, "Yes [I have learned something new about Tagalog], like for instance the use of locatives. I did not know it then, but I can understand it better now. You see, if I don't understand something, I ask her [the tutee] too." In the case of English, the tutors increased their vocabulary and generally became more confident and fluent. One of the tutor's high school teachers mentioned that she had become more "local" (i.e., sounding more like she was from Hawai'i) and that her interaction skills had improved. The Samoan tutors were able to revive the formal language they currently rarely use, but which is taught at universities.

ACADEMIC AND PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

Not only did tutors benefit linguistically from interacting with the university foreign language learners, they also experienced positive academic and personal benefits from these partnerships. Tutors and tutees often developed close relationships, and in many cases, the tutors saw the tutees as role models. Since most of the tutees were from the same cultural background as the tutors, they were living proof that it would be possible for the tutors to succeed in college too.

> [When I first met my tutee] I introduced myself to her...I was first...later she told me...my life was terrible...afterwards she told me about herself...she has the same hard life as I do...we are two of a kind...she has a child...she has a live-in boyfriend, her boyfriend helps her with little spending money...she attends the UH on scholarship. But if she can make it, maybe I can too. (Shelly)

Even when close relationships did not develop, it was an opportunity to interact with college students and see what college life is like. Sometimes the university students were majoring in fields that the tutors were interested in studying, and they were able to find out more about those fields. Tutees also encouraged the tutors to try to go to college, to apply for scholarships and other special programs. Shelly concludes that "...this [tutoring job] is good because I get to meet people who are studying [UH] courses," and Candy adds, "My tutee tells me about college life, helps me with my English."

Some of the tutors did not have a great deal of contact with college students outside of this project, and would not have if it were not for the program, such as Candy who reveals that, "It [the project] is helping me in a lot of ways. It feels like it broadens my perspectives on things because, you see, my tutee shares with me about a lot of things they do in college. It also improves my English." It seems that the interaction with university students and the increased familiarity with the campus

(due to having the sessions on campus) gave the high school tutors more confidence in going to college, even if they thought they might go to a community college rather than the University of Hawai'i.

The tutors were generally able to maintain good grades in high school while they worked in the program. Most of them had some kind of college plans, typically going to a community college. Several of them were planning on careers such as nursing in which their multilingual skills would be an advantage. Through participating in the Foreign Language Partnership Project, the tutors generally gained confidence in their ability to attend and succeed in college. Several tutees encouraged tutors to go to college and reassured them about the expenses. For example, Marissa states, "[My tutee] always said it [the University of Hawai'i] is already cheap because she always compare to the Mainland. She always said it's cheap, come here," and Shelly says, "she [her tutee] said college is more fun, and I'm excited to go to college."

It was somewhat difficult for tutors to self-reflect and analyze how tutoring had helped them, but most felt they had personally benefited. They felt that they became more responsible and mature due to the nature of the job, teaching someone who was older than them. As one tutor put it, "I feel like teacher already." Shelly adds

> Tutoring helped me in getting mature...cause like, your tutee is older than you, yeah, so you gotta act like more older than them, like you know, like sometimes us, when the person is older than you, you gotta respect them, yeah, you don't have to, when you teach them like that, when you teach the, you have to like, you have to act older than them.

Tutors also felt proud of themselves because they were able to help college students. They had a new respect for themselves and their abilities.

> Right now I feel really good because my hardship in tutoring her really helps her a lot now. I'm very proud of her and of course of myself too because I really didn't expect that because of my first language I could help a college student like her. And that really makes me very happy. I'm lucky to be chose as one of the tutors. (Lena)

Tutors also felt their communication skills had improved. Not only had their language skills developed, but their interpersonal skills improved as well. They became more comfortable talking to new people.

> I feel better now because like I just learned how to communicate with new people like that cause I used to be nervous and ashamed when I first met people, like that and I don't know how to talk long like that, but um I just learned how to communicate and talk openly with them like that, that's how I learned. (Marissa)

They also benefited from an emotional standpoint, especially those tutors who became close to their tutees. Wendy observes, "I learned self-esteem, can talk about

your problems, you can help each other, so you're not so shy." In addition, several tutors learned valuable time-management and planning skills through holding another job as well as tutoring. Shelly observes, "I learned to figure out myself, how to plan, so I can work with her [the tutee]."

The FLPP position was generally seen as a high status job among family and friends, in part due to the high hourly wage (which was substantially higher than the average job a high school student has and in some cases higher than tutors' parents' jobs) and in part due to the prestige of teaching university students.

> I'm glad I did it [this job] because my grandma was proud of me. [She said] 'Oh, you're teaching UH student? They're high level,' things like that, yeah, then you're only high school. I'm glad you got that job. (Analyn)

One of the tutors related how her teacher, after finding out about her job, had conducted a survey in the class to see how much students were getting paid; the tutor had the highest hourly wage. Candy relates that "My friends say, 'You're better off than we are,' or 'You're so lucky'."

The tutors had not previously seen their language skills as something that could earn them money. Once they realized the financial benefits of being bilingual, they were proud and happy. Shelly says, "I am happy because I get paid for using my language...it's like, I never expected this, that I can earn by simply speaking my own language." Of course, this tutor did more than simply speak her own language, but she had previously taken her language skills for granted. Immigrant students typically are placed into remedial classes and judged for what they lack rather than for what they have. In the FLPP, students' language skills were recognized and they were given a high-prestige job which required responsibility. This recognition appears to have resulted in increased pride and self-esteem for the students, both in terms of how they felt about themselves, and how their family and friends saw them.

Tutors all expressed pride in their first language and pride in helping others, especially college students, learn it. They also viewed being bilingual (or multilingual) as an advantage, both personally and economically. They used their own language at home and in the public domain when interacting with other native speakers (i.e., at school, work, shopping centers) and feel this is appropriate. Shelly says, "When I use my first language, ma'am, I feel proud of myself, and when I see a fellow Filipino, I would want us to use our first language always." To forget one's first language would be like "rejecting our culture," as another tutor put it. Shelly adds, "[My language] is very important because that's my native language, yeah, and I proud to speak because I proud to be Filipino...I don't forget it no matter what because that's my first language." Their families were also proud that they were teaching their language to others, perhaps out of ethnic pride, as Analyn indicates: "[My parents] are happy, cause like you're teaching your own language to another. They said that's good, you can help another how to speak Ilokano."

The tutors also feel that English is important and they use it whenever a situation arises in which people do not speak their language. They feel it is important for immigrants and their descendants to maintain their language and want their children to be bilingual in their heritage language and English. However, tutors also recognize that it can be difficult to pass along an immigrant language to children born in this country. They had the example of their tutees, who for the most part came from the ethnic background of the language they were studying, and they realize how pervasive English is. A few tutors mentioned that there is pressure at school from teachers and other students to speak only English and not their native language. June states, "I found out it's, you know how kids over here they grow up, they have a different life, they can't, I don't know, like nobody gonna teach them, they always speak English all the time."

The tutors were generally committed to passing their language along to their children and continuing to teach the language to any who had lost it. Candy observes, "I only wish that they could add more tutors to the program so that more college students will get help...those Filipino, those local Filipinos who want to study their own language." With the heightened awareness of the possibilities of language loss, which many language minority groups do not see until is too late (Fishman, 1991), these students may be able to take a more active role in maintaining their language, either within the community as a whole, or at least with their families.

CONCLUSIONS

Throughout the project, the value of one-on-one or one-on-two interaction was evident. Even when university classes had opportunities for negotiation for meaning, they often involved only one or two students at a time; whereas, during the tutoring sessions, the tutees were constantly engaged in interaction with the tutors and each other. Metalinguistic discussion (e.g., about grammar rules) was generally embedded in the context of a conversation or text rather than being presented in the abstract through a textbook. Other aspects of language development, such as fluency, listening comprehension, and pronunciation, were not analyzed specifically, but nearly all of the participants, tutors and tutees alike, noted improvement in these areas.[5] In addition to achieving notable gains in language development among tutees, the tutors developed metalinguistic awareness and, thus, were able to improve both their native language and English language skills. Tutors also inevitably came to appreciate their bilingualism as a resource, rather than view their native language as a problem. Finally, the tutors were able to develop the self-confidence and interpersonal skills needed to succeed in college and other social or occupational arenas.

[5] Since the interactional moves and the interactional theory of language acquisition are based on oral language, it is unclear what relationship they may have with written language or with literacy events that occur within the context of a class or tutoring session. Although not investigated here, the development of language through literacy events is a promising area of inquiry.

In sum, the activities initiated by tutors revealed ways in which foreign language partnerships can facilitate language learning. Research in second language acquisition stresses the importance of language learning in authentic and meaningful contexts where students have opportunities to use the language for actual communicative purposes (Ellis, 1985; Snow, Met, and Genesee, 1989). They also point to the facilitative nature of collaboration in language learning (Nunan, 1992). Bilingual education scholars (Cummins, 1986; Rosaldo, 1989; Trueba, 1987, 1989) and those who have conducted research with minority student populations (Henze and Vannet, 1993; Lucas, Henze, and Donato, 1991; Syed and Burnett, this volume) suggest the importance of linguistic and cultural identity as having measured influence in students' academic success. They maintain that collaborative efforts must involve valuing the culture, language, literacy, and other characteristics that language minority students bring with them. Through the interest expressed by the tutees in the language and cultural experiences that the tutors could offer, the linguistic skills and culture of the latter were validated. At the same time, the tutees were able to rediscover their own partially lost language and culture.

REFERENCES

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 372–390.

Davis, K. A. (1995). Qualitative theory and methods in applied linguistics research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(3), 427–453.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift*. Clevedon: Multulingual Matters.

Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies of Second Language Acquisition*, *16*(3), 283–302.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second langauge acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings* (pp. 401–435). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Henze, R., & Vanett, L. (1993). To walk in two worlds — or more? Challenging a common metaphor of Native education. *Anthropology and Education*, *24*(2), 116–134.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. London: Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.

Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 126–141.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York: Academic Press.

Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1991). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students. In M. Minami & B. Kennedy (Eds.), *Language issues in literacy and bilingual/multicultural education* (pp. 456–482). Cambridge: Harvard Educational Review.

Moll, L. (1992). Bilingual classroom studies and community analysis: Some recent trends. *Educational Researcher, 21*(2), 20–24.

Nunan, D. (Ed.). (1992). *Collaborative language learning and teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pica, T. (1991). Classroom interaction, participation, and comprehension: redefining relationships. *System, 19*, 437–452.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44*(3), 493–527.

Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., & Morganthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11*, 63–90

Rabie, S. (1996). *Negative feedback, modeling, and vocabulary acquisition in task-based interaction.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu.

Rosaldo, R. (1989). *Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Schachter, J. (1986). Three approaches to the study of input. *Language Learning, 36*(2), 211–225.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13*, 206–226.

Snow, M. A., Met, M., & Genessee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language programs. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(2), 201–217.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 16*(2), 371–391.

Trueba, H. T. (Ed.). (1987). *Success or failure: Learning and language minority student.* New York: Newbury House.

Trueba, H. T. (1989). *Raising silent voices: Educating the linguistic minorities for the 21st century.* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Audrey C. Burnett
University of Hawai'i
Zafar Syed
Military Language Institute, United Arab Emirates

EMERGING IDENTITIES AND HERITAGE LANGUAGE EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

As detailed elsewhere (Syed & Burnett, this volume), there has been considerable research in the social sciences looking at the acculturation process of immigrants in North America and Britain. These studies have served to highlight a number of issues related to first language and culture that need to be considered by policy makers, school administrators, and teachers. It is clear from the research done thus far (Cummins, 1986; Erickson, 1987; Ghuman, 1991; Henze & Vanett, 1993; Hoffman, 1989; Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1991; Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1991; Stopes-Roe & Cochrane, 1990) that education for immigrants should involve the development of first language skills and heritage cultural identity. Both of these factors are instrumental in immigrant students' academic success and social well-being. Additionally, schools need to stop labeling immigrant students as deficient, unmotivated, or limited, and start utilizing the wealth of resources these students bring to educational settings. Creating an environment which facilitates the above goals has not been fully explored at any educational level nor, consequently, have the benefits of such programs been documented. The Foreign Language Partnership Project (FLPP) was designed in part to specifically address the above issues. This chapter will report on some of the outcomes associated with this project as they relate to immigrants' sociocultural identity. The focus here will be on how these students continually define, and redefine, themselves as they struggle to find their voice and place in a multicultural society.

A STUDY OF IDENTITY

PARTICIPANTS

The participants in this study not only included those participating in the Foreign Language Partnership Project (see Shonle & Thompson Rolland, this volume), but also students enrolled in Filipino language classes at the university and immigrant students at a local high school. The university students attended the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (UH) which is located on the island of O'ahu. An acknowledged strength of UH is the number of foreign language classes it offers. In any given academic year, UH provides classes in 29 different languages including less

Burnett, A. C., & Syed, Z. (1999). The Foreign Language Partnership Project. In K. A. Davis (Ed.), *Foreign language teaching and language minority education*. (Technical Report #19, pp. 1-17). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

commonly taught languages such as Hindi, Samoan, and Burmese. The students participating in the study were enrolled in first and second year Tagalog and Ilokano language classes. The majority of the students (74%) are Filipino Americans who attended high school in Hawai'i. Either one or both parents of these students are multilingual speakers of English, Tagalog, and/or indigenous languages such as Ilokano and Visayan. These parents tended to still speak their native language at home with their spouse and other relatives while their children primarily speak English. Some of the university students in the study reported that they could understand but not speak Ilokano or Tagalog. Ninety-six percent of the students reported that neither Ilokano nor Tagalog were offered as a part of the foreign language curriculum in their high school.

The high school students in the study were from Pacific High School (a pseudonym). Pacific High School (PHS) is located in Honolulu, situated in an area surrounded by homes and businesses. There are approximately 2000 students attending PHS and the majority of these students are immigrants from Samoa, Vietnam, Tonga, and the Philippines. Immigrants from the Philippines make up the largest proportion of the student population. The high school participants for the study described here come from the Philippines and were enrolled in an advanced reading class in the ELEC (English Language Enrichment Center).[1] Some of the students are speakers of two or three languages/dialects. Neither Ilokano, Tagalog, nor any other Filipino language are currently offered as subjects at the high school. Students whose first language is not English are tested by the school system to determine if they need to enroll in ESL courses.

METHODOLOGY

The study described here was designed to discover the "forces" that affect the attitudes of the Filipino immigrant students in maintaining their native language and the attitudes of the university students towards learning Ilokano or Tagalog as a second language. In order to uncover and understand student attitudes as they affect identity, a qualitative approach was taken. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) state that

> The openness of qualitative inquiry allows the researcher to approach the inherent complexity of social interaction and to do justice to that complexity, to respect it in its own right. Qualitative researchers avoid simplifying social phenomena and instead explore the range of behavior and expand their understanding of the resulting interactions. Throughout the research process, they assume that social interaction is complex and that they will uncover some of that complexity." (p. 7)

Data for the study was collected through interviews, participant observations, and written documentation (students' essays, questionnaires, journals, and field notes). Our focus in collecting the data was to understand participants' perspectives through their own words and actions. All participants were interviewed as were all their respective teachers/instructors. Interviews were tape recorded and transcribed.

[1] ESL teachers at this high school have opted to change the name of the ESL program from SLEP to ELEC, the English Language Enrichment Center.

Observations were conducted both in the high school and university classrooms as well as outside the classroom during everyday social activities. Classroom observations at the high school were done once a week for the school year 1995–1996. Observations of the university students in their respective classes were conducted once a week (for fifty minutes) for three months in Spring 1995. Field notes were kept of all observations.

Data were also collected through a questionnaire concerning university students' motivation for studying Ilokano/Tagalog; follow-up interviews were scheduled to further explore issues revealed by the questionnaire. Finally, university students' essays and journals (written in the course of their foreign language study at UH) were made available as further material for this study.

Given our theoretical framework (see Syed and Burnett, this volume) and the fact that we were working with first and second generation immigrant students, we were interested in exploring the following questions:

> How do immigrant students define themselves and their sociocultural needs?
>
> What factors are at work in their perception of their cultural identity?
>
> What attitudes, values, and beliefs do these students have with respect to language and culture?
>
> How has the process of cross-cultural adjustment impacted these students?

Guided by the above questions, data (field notes, transcripts, written documentation) were analyzed with the general goal of gaining a better understanding of the important issues at work as these students adjust to their polycultural worlds and multilingual orientations.

FINDINGS

The following descriptions of issues of student identity represent four major themes identified in the qualitative research data: a1) the search for identity among university students, b) emerging identities, c) language use in sociocultural context, and d) the tensions created by assimilationist pressures.

WHO WE ARE AND WHAT WE NEED

At the beginning of each Fall semester, the Tagalog department conducts a survey of students enrolled in their classes to gather biographical data such as students' language background and their parents' first language. The students are also asked to rate their ability in any Filipino language that they speak and/or understand. Many of the students indicated that their parents' first language is a "dialect" of the Philippines and that their own first language is English. There were some students who claimed Ilokano or Visayan as their first language and rated their ability in that

language from poor to good. Most students whose first language is Tagalog rated their ability as "good." One portion of the survey asked the students for their reasons in taking the course. A number of responses indicated a need to fulfill the university language requirement: "Need a foreign language to graduate;" "To meet foreign language requirements at UH;" "It's a requirement for my major." Although these responses might indicate that there is no real interest in the language other than "to fulfill core requirements" to get a degree, other students indicated a personal interest in the language itself. These students commented, "To fulfill my language requirement and because I am interested in the language;" "Personal knowledge;" and "...also to learn the native language of my parents and relatives." The remaining responses show a personal interest in the culture and language for communicative purposes: "[I want to] learn how to speak Tagalog so I can go back to the Philippines to speak to my relatives easily;" "I want to learn the language;" "to be able to understand and communicate in Tagalog;" "to improve and perfect my Tagalog speaking skills;" "to improve my ability to speak and understand the language;" and "I want to learn the major Filipino language because sometimes I feel inadequate in conversations with my relatives and native-speaking friends. I also want to broaden my knowledge of Tagalog, which, as a Filipino, is very poor."

For many of the Filipino university students enrolled in Ilokano or Tagalog courses, the desire to learn their heritage language is firmly situated in a perceived need to "get back to [their] roots" and to learn more about the culture and language of their ethnicity.

> At times I feel I'm Filipino by name for the reasons that I do not speak the language or know much about the culture or historical background of my ancestors. And when asked what nationality are you, I answer back, "Filipino," with a little hesitation.

Whether the students wish to converse with their immediate and extended family or to explore notions of who they are, taking a Filipino language course is one step towards achieving their goal. For many of these students, learning about their culture and language is a way of expressing themselves in the "Filipino way." Defining or finding themselves through language helps them to gain an identity within the multicultural world in which they live.

EMERGING IDENTITIES

For a number of the university students, participation in foreign language education is part of a more comprehensive course of personal development. In this process students seem to be drawing on historical, experiential, familial, and personal factors to forge a notion of themselves that is identifiable and comfortable. In an essay designed to elicit what it means to be Filipino, students highlight this ongoing self-exploration. One student writes, "I am very proud to be a Filipino and I would rather not exist at all if I were to be somebody else." Yet another responds quite differently, "...there are times when I don't want to be associated as a Filipino but rather as Spanish." Some students reflected that little or no exposure to their

cultural heritage has caused them to question "Who I am and what is the history of my heritage?" Suzanna[2] details this in the following excerpt from her essay:

> ...it is hoped that we all realize the value and meaning of our past, our culture and our roots. Maturing has helped me develop an identity for myself that includes my Filipino heritage — a heritage that I have not always acknowledged or been aware of. For that I am ashamed.

These students are seemingly in the process of figuring out their role and place in the worlds they inhabit. Suzanna, not unlike others, is embarking on a path of putting all the pieces of her identity together in order to gain a sense of completeness. A sense of identity can be instrumental in establishing purpose and meaning in life; it can also create barriers and be a source of frustration (Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1991).

We sought to learn more about why students were taking heritage language classes when the majority come from homes where both parents are native, or fluent, speakers of Tagalog/Ilokano. Jonalynn says,

> Ever since we were at a young age, our parents began speaking to us in Pangasinan, Ilokano, and Tagalog. They always stressed the importance of being exposed to the Filipino language and cultures because that was who we were and will always be.

For some students, the failure to develop some kind of fluency in their heritage language has given them a sense of guilt. Jonalynn's essay details her involvement in high school as an officer of a Filipino club; the club was active in promoting the language and culture of the Philippines through members' participation as Filipino representatives in various events. Jonalynn displays a sense of pride in her Filipino heritage and, despite her efforts and commitment to the Filipino club, she admits, "I thought it was a shame that I did not know how to speak the language." The shame that she felt led, in part, to her wanting to "study Tagalog at UH so that I can communicate both in writing and speaking with my family, relatives, friends, and future acquaintances."

Suzanna, another heritage language learner, similarly expressed being "ashamed" of not being fully aware and appreciative of her Filipino heritage. She writes about an experience of a trip to her parents' hometown province where her grandparents still reside:

> Again, I was ashamed and also saddened to be in the Philippines. There I was, totally Americanized, knowing nothing of the real Filipino lifestyle or language. I saw the disappointment in my grandparents' eyes because I was unable to communicate with them...These incidents hit me pretty hard.

[2] All names are pseudonyms.

Not surprisingly, Suzanna's goal for the Tagalog language class is "to achieve fluency so I'll have something to say to my Lolo and Lola the next time I see them."

Students' emerging identities are also impacted by the realities of their participation in at least two distinct sociocultural groups — heritage and mainstream. Katheena writes that she is proud to be Filipino and carries with her traditions that are Filipino. "Unfortunately, I am not fluent in Ilokano and that's a loss to me because that is a loss of my culture. I can understand what is being said, but I can't respond in the language." She goes on to say that "being second generation Filipino is hard. We have already assimilated in the American/local culture and our first language is English." Similarly, Leslie, a freshman at UH says,

> Ever since I was little they always taught me to remember Ilokano, because it was our native language...My parents and all that came from the Philippines, right, so they all speak Ilokano to us but of course we (the second generation of family) still speak English.

It was very important for Leslie's mother to teach her daughter their native language, but there was also the recognition that English, too, would need to be learned. Leslie's mother taught her basic English words before she started going to school where English would be the medium of instruction. Although Leslie is able to understand Ilokano when it is spoken, she says that "there's some (siblings) that doesn't understand Filipino at all." We also asked Shelly, a sophomore taking Tagalog at UH, if she had a difficult time in school because her parents spoke to her in English and Ilokano. She replied,

> Well, not really because, I don't know if it's good or bad, I consider myself Americanized, but I guess it's bad because I don't know the (Filipino) language as much as I should know. But it's easy to assimilate into the American society this way. I guess it has it's good and bad points.

David also comes from a home in which he says that Ilokano and English are spoken. He is a junior enrolled in an Ilokano class. When asked why he was taking Ilokano he simply answered, "For core requirement." His mother reads Ilokano magazines and listens to Ilokano radio stations, and he says,

> ...for me I can read it (Ilokano) and understand it, so I'm kind of familiar with Ilokano. It's just the writing part and the speaking — if I have to speak I have to think about what I have to say.

David's parents speak to him in Ilokano and he responds in English because he feels more "comfortable" with this language. The only context, outside of his Ilokano class, where he speaks Ilokano is when he talks with his grandmother. His grandmother "speaks very little English."

Although these families instill in their children a sense of pride in their heritage identity, the fact that they live in a country where their culture and language are in

the minority can have devastating effects on these students. The home often represents one culture and the "outside world" another. The monocultural model presented at school may "block" bicultural knowledge that is needed so that a person will have "the volition and capacity to negotiate comfortably two sets of cultural assumptions, patterns, values, beliefs, and behaviors" (Nieto, 1992). As Katheena mentioned before, assimilation into the US mainstream school culture is the reason why her first language is English and not a Filipino language.

SOCIAL CONTEXT: LANGUAGE IN USE

Social environment naturally dictates how language is used. Each language has certain domains, or areas of utility, in which it operates. An examination of how a particular language fulfills these usage requirements for its users can provide insights into not only its utility, but also the language choices these speakers make on a daily basis. In Mandy's home, her parents use their native language of Ilokano — a language Mandy is now studying at UH. When she talks with her parents it is in a mixture of Ilokano and English; her parents often need her assistance when English needs to be spoken. Parents and other relatives' use the heritage language and the second generation's use of English is a common pattern among participants in this study. When asked how she feels now about using Ilokano at home, Mandy replied,

> It's okay with me now. Before I used to be timid about speaking Ilokano but now I guess, because of my experience when I went to the Philippines, it's more like you're much more proud that you are. For me it's all right.

When asked why she did not have this pride before her experience in the Philippines, she said, "Because I wasn't really exposed to the culture as I am now."

For the most part, university students in this study reported that they had not used their heritage language outside the classroom. They have, however, begun to use it much more at family gatherings, the dinner table, and especially when conversing with grandparents and other elderly relatives. These students have found that speaking in their heritage language provides them with access to a wealth of information. As they continue to develop their multicultural/multilingual identities, they increasingly view their heritage language in a positive light and use it more often.

TENSIONS WITHIN

Whether adjusting to a new social context (acculturation) or coming to grips with one's multicultural identity, an individual invariably is confronted with often conflicting questions concerning his/her beliefs and assumptions. This internal struggle is commonly an everyday occurrence in these students' lives. Robert, a second generation junior taking Tagalog, writes that there are so many ethnic backgrounds in Hawai'i that one can get lost and forget one's own culture. "This was the case that happened to me." Robert identifies not being in touch with his roots as his reason for taking Tagalog at UH:

> When I was young I watched a lot of TV, yeah, and my parents, they didn't expose my sister and I to much (Filipino) culture. In a way they promoted us to more English and the local programming here didn't show much Filipino programming.

Robert says that both of his parents had two jobs to make ends meet; his parents promoted English (over Tagalog) so that their children would have a better chance to "survive out in the real world." For Robert's parents, having their children assimilate into the dominant language and culture was the key to success in mainstream society. However, these parental views created negative and sometimes conflicting feelings for Robert concerning his heritage culture. For example, Robert's favorite childhood pastime was watching Black Belt Theater (showing martial arts movies) on TV. Given his fascination and love for martial arts, he soon developed an admiration for the Japanese and Chinese cultures. Upon discovering that the Filipino culture also has their own type of martial arts, he says, "At that time, I looked down upon it. I had thought that it was inferior to Karate or Kung Fu. Anyway, from that point I rejected my own ethnic culture, thinking that it was dumb and artificial. I refused to learn anything dealing with Filipino." He recalls,

> I remember when I was younger, I used to tease a lot of FOBs ("Fresh Off the Boat," a term used to label immigrants) [as] bok bok![3] I teased their accent, made fun of their color coordinating clothes, and their way of trying to adapt to the local lifestyle in Hawai'i. People like Frank Delima[4] gave a projection that it was all right to tease people from other countries for good laughs, especially Filipinos. At that time, some of my friends and I was not as concerned about our cultural identity as we should. We just wanted a good laugh! In fact, many of the young local Filipinos did not speak much of the language in public due to fear of being ridiculed by the other ethnic backgrounds. In this fear of humiliation, there existed a separation between the local Filipinos and the Filipinos overseas. The results were distrust and alienation of young Filipinos from the Philippines. It might be that this barrier prompted these young Pinoys (Filipino in Tagalog) to join gangs for protection and identity.

The Filipino cultures and languages are generally not well accepted in Hawai'i. Malia, a high school senior who has been in Hawai'i for about three years, attests to the local Filipinos' teasing of immigrant Filipinos. In discussing immigrant Filipino stereotypes, such as that they eat black dog, Malia said that she generally thought these stereotypes were funny. However, she admitted that on one particular occasion she felt hurt by a local Filipino's accusation that she "eats black dog" . On another occasion, a local Filipino girl made the comment, "Oh, look at those bok-boks (referring to a group of Filipino immigrants)!" and the girl's friends laughed at what she had said. Malia remembers thinking, "Why is she saying bok-bok? She's Filipino too...why does she have to say that? It kinda hurts." Malia seemed

---

[3] Tagalog term meaning termite, but also used to refer to Filipinos. It came about during the plantation days when the Filipino workers would use small pieces of wood-like toothpicks, to clean their teeth.

[4] A popular Hawaiian comedian whose on stage routines often involve the various immigrant groups in Hawai'i.

particularly disturbed by this recollection; when further questioned about such incidences, she became quiet and subdued.

Katheena, a Hawaiian born Filipina, writes about the distinction between two types of Filipinos here in Hawai'i:

> When I was a teenager, we (my friends and I) were all Filipino, but we weren't Filipino. Filipino to us was almost a negative connotation. We were Filipino but we weren't Buks (Filipino immigrant). Meaning, we weren't from the Philippines, so we weren't totally Filipino, but we were Filipino-Americans. There was a difference between the two, or so we thought...I had a negative view of my culture.

This inner tension, or separation of self, between a Filipino and a Filipino-American is further illustrated by Julia:

> Honestly, when I was younger, I had looked down on my race. The stereotyping was so excessive and to the extreme where I lived, that I was ashamed of who I was. Filipinos were characterized as being dumb and uncivilized. Some of the things that has been said or are said even till this day are, that "black dog" is a delicacy of ours and our favorite colors are those that don't match, like purple and orange.

Other students had similar views:

> Although America is said to be some type of melting pot, I still see a hierarchy of nationalities where Filipinos are struggling to make their mark...way back in intermediate school, other cultures, especially Samoans and Hawaiians, used to put down Filipinos and treat them as ignorant and *Cho-cho* (fat) lips, black dog eaters, high-haired and 'book-book' (Filipino immigrant) are just a few of the terms associated with Filipinos here in Hawai'i. It is no wonder that so many Filipinos in Hawai'i are ashamed of their race.

This rejection or distancing of oneself from his/her heritage is not uncommon among immigrants. Weinreich (1983) and Liebkind (1984), among others, suggest that conflict arises over ethnic identification when a person belongs to a social group which becomes a source of guilt and shame. One way to resolve the conflict is for the person to change his/her identity so that those shameful characteristics are not part of their concept of self. Or one can reappraise the unwanted characteristics so that she/he can preserve their identity without harmful effects to the self-esteem. When asked how the stereotyping and teasing of Filipinos affected her, Shelley responded,

> Well, personally I guess it's my background of being Americanized. Personally I don't really care. But I know some people are really really offended by them, but I respect that. But to me the thing is, every nationality has a racial stereotype, these stereotypes don't really offend me but I know that they offend others...but I suppose it's sort of my background of being Americanized. It sort of, this Americanization is this wall that keeps me from being truly offended. Since it's attacking our culture,

> and since I'm so Americanized I'm really wasn't exposed to that kind of [thing], so I'm sort of looking at it from the outside in a way.

Whether or not people take offense to the stereotyping of the Filipinos, there seems to be a common consensus that Filipino-Americans are greatly at fault for fostering these stereotypes, perhaps as a distancing maneuver and way to identify with mainstream and/or local culture.

Language can also be a catalyst for engendering feelings of separation from one's heritage culture. Michelle is currently getting A's and B's in her high school courses. She is a sophomore and she has been living in Hawai'i for about two years. In the Philippines, she went to a school where English was one of her subjects, but she says that she feels more comfortable speaking her first language which is Tagalog. We asked how she felt about speaking English and she says, "sometimes they laugh at you, your class[mates], because the way you talk, the way you speak." When asked whether these students that laughed at her were Filipino Americans, she responded "yes." A number of high school participants gave similar accounts. Being ostracized for their mannerisms, speech, and style along with the peer pressure of fitting into the mainstream results in moving these students away from their heritage membership. Ironically, the second generation university students now find themselves trying to reclaim the heritage that they had previously rejected.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Clearly, exploring one's identity in a multicultural context is a dynamic and comprehensive process worthy of attention and study. There are a number of concerns that the present study has served to highlight — both for the immigrant and the heritage language student.

For the university students, learning their heritage language appears to be a tangible way of trying to (re)acquaint themselves with their heritage. This journey back to their roots involves reflecting on long standing assumptions about their ethnicity and culture, questioning their attitudes/practices, and preparing for future needs. For many of these students, this is the first time they have seriously considered identity issues and taken steps to make some changes that reflect their heritage. The pressures of fitting in or conforming to the mainstream norms during their early years have been so overpowering that some, like Robert, actually began to reject their own heritage culture. Having to suppress a part of themselves for these many years has extracted a great deal of psycho-social energy and left some emotional scars. These students made a conscious effort not to be mistaken as immigrant Filipinos but rather as Filipino-Americans — simply because the former were viewed in negative terms for exhibiting too much of their heritage culture. One is left to wonder how a more positive image of their heritage could have impacted these students' self-esteem, confidence, and academic performance over the years.

This journey university students have taken into their past also appears to be inherently intertwined with their over-all maturation. Only as these students moved from adolescence into adulthood were they able to discover and secure their particular place in society. Part of this discovery was to first understand their own identity and station in life. As university students, these participants are exposed to greater diversity (of ideas, values, cultures) and are expected to formulate and articulate their personal philosophies. In this respect, they are moving away from opinions and beliefs filtered through group norms and towards ideologies based more on personal preferences and concerns. By the same token, however, they are also beginning to respond to the expectations of others (outside the small world of high school and the neighborhood) in society. A number of students commented on how others, at the university and in the Philippines, expected them to be able to speak either Ilokano or Tagalog — given their ethnicity. This served as a wake up call to some of the participants to initiate the process of "going back to my roots." Also, as they mature they begin to consider some of the new roles they will soon have to play. A number of the participants spoke about wanting their own children to learn Ilokano/Tagalog and educating them about the "Filipino way."

Given students' early efforts to assimilate and succeed in mainstream culture while distancing themselves from their heritage culture, using the heritage language was previously never a major concern. However, with their recent movement towards redefining their identity, their heritage language suddenly has a utility and place in their lives. Without this language they remain on the outside looking in. These students feel that (re)learning their heritage language is important if they are going to claim that aspect of their background as part of their identity. Their heritage language allows them to communicate with elders and family members. The language also becomes a point of entry into the literature, movies, pop-culture, and life-styles of the Philippines. For these and other reasons associated with identity and social success, it is of great importance that heritage language skills be valued, recognized, and developed during the educational process.

Finally, our work with the students who participated in the study has given us insight into the intergenerational struggles that are operating in their families. The students' parents are seemingly torn between wanting their children to succeed in an English dominant society and wanting them not to lose their heritage identity. The parents believe, perhaps from their own life experiences, that being fully functional in the dominant culture is a key to academic success and social mobility. This is not uncommon. Immigrant groups have historically seen an urgency to have subsequent generations become fluent in the dominant language in the hope of having them blend in.[5] In many cases, acquiring the dominant language has been done with total disregard to maintaining the heritage language. The language skills of immigrants have never been valued by the host culture; consequently, immigrants rarely seriously entertain notions of language maintenance. It is interesting to note that only after the family feels secure in their membership in

[5] Parents have been helped in this cause by the "Americanization" policies in education. For a good historical account see Spring, 1994.

mainstream society, that notions of revitalizing their heritage language are seriously considered.

For the immigrant high school students, issues of identity, language maintenance/usage, costs of adjusting into mainstream culture, and redefining oneself are immediate. These students are going through the process of identity formation on a day-to-day basis. With each interchange, incidence, and interaction their image of themselves and their surroundings are taking shape. It is increasingly clear that academic institutions should not only take into account these acculturative stresses, but also attempt to improve the conditions under which immigrants are schooled. Immigrant students should not be labeled "deficient," "limited," or "unmotivated;" schools should acknowledge the various languages and cultures these students bring into the classroom and dedicate themselves to maintaining/developing these valuable resources. Programs like the Foreign Language Partnership Project need to be developed in order to give immigrant students an important contributing role within education. The resulting impact on students' self-esteem and confidence can be instrumental in these students academic and social development (see Shonle & Thompson Rolland, this volume). Lastly, there is a need to resolve power differentials between recent immigrants and established ethnic communities.

An effort has been made to critically examine the acculturation process and academic achievement in order to get a broader perspective on issues relating to heritage language/cultural identity. A micro-analysis of the Foreign Language Partnership Project has detailed complex and broad ranging factors affecting the ways in which heritage language learners and immigrant students define themselves. Critical reflection, language utility, and maturation all contribute to heritage language learners' journey to get back to their roots. It is clear from this study that there are inherent benefits for a multicultural society like Hawai'i to maintain its diversity through programs like the Foreign Language Partnership Project.

REFERENCES

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Education Review*, 56, 18–36.

Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18, 335–382.

Ghuman, P. A. S. (1991). Have they passed the cricket test? A 'qualitative' study of Asian adolescents. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 12(5), 327–346.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researcher: An introduction.* White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Company

Henze, R., & Vanett, L. (1993). To walk in two worlds — or more? Challenging a common metaphor of native education. *Anthropology and Education*, 24(2), 116–134.

Hoffman, D. (1989). Language and culture acquisition among Iranians in the United States. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 20*(2), 118- 132.

Liebkind, K. (1984). Minority identity and identification processes: A social psychological study. *Commentationes Scientiarum Socialium No. 22: The Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters.*

Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1991). Promoting the success of Latino language- minority students. In M. Minami & B. Kennedy (Eds.), *Language issues in literacy and bilingual/multicultural* education (456–482) Cambridge: Harvard Educational Review.

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Company.

Phelan, P., Davidson, A., & Cao, H. (1991). Students' multiple worlds. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 22*(3), 224–249.

Spring, J. (1994). *The American school 1642–1993.* New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Stopes-Roe, M., & Cochrane, R. (1990). *Citizens of this country: The Asian-British.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Weinreich, P. (1983). Emerging from threatened identities: Ethnicity and gender in redefinitions of ethnic identity. In G. Breakwell (Ed.). *Threatened identities* (149-185). New York: John Wiley.

Ann Shonle
Newcomer Pathways, Boulder Valley School District, Colorado
Zafar Syed
Military Language Institute, United Arab Emirates

CONCLUSIONS: THE BENEFITS AND PROMISE OF LANGUAGE PARTNERSHIPS

It has been amply demonstrated (see Jasso-Aguilar, this volume and Ortega, this volume) that there is a serious failure in language education in this country to meet the needs of both majority and minority language-speaking students. The Foreign Language Partnership Project (FLPP) attempts to address this failure by capitalizing on the available language resources and matching those resources with those who need it. It also recognizes that immigrants and minority students have the right to speak, learn, and maintain their heritage language.

Foreign language teaching, particularly at the university level, has typically denied the political implications of its work. In Hawai'i, for the languages involved in this program (Ilokano, Tagalog, and Samoan), language instructors are perhaps more politicized than most, seeing their role as promoting the use and retention of the language they teach. Garcia (1992) suggests that all second language teachers become language activists involved in status and corpus planning, join efforts to raise the prestige of ethnic languages with regard to English, and make room in the second language classroom for corpora of various language varieties and languages in contact gathered from the ethnolinguistic speech communities in the United States.

It should be recognized that programs similar to the FLPP have been developed which try to make connections between the typically marginalized language minority students and the mainstream majority students trying to learn other languages. For example, Huebner and his colleagues (Huebner, Bartolome, Avelar-Lasalle, & Azevedo, 1989) set up a program in which immigrant high school students who spoke Spanish tutored English-speaking high school students who were studying Spanish. The focus of the FLPP is slightly different in that most university students studying a foreign language, in fact, come from the same language background as their tutors and are trying to reclaim their lost language and culture. There is also more of an emphasis on collaboration and partnership in the exchange between the university students and high school tutors; the university students act as role models and facilitate exposure to university life for the high school tutors.

The tutoring sessions seemed to benefit the language development of the university students from a SLA theoretical perspective. Although this study was not an experimental program with a highly controlled research design which would show

Shonle, A., & Syed, Z. (1999). Conclusions: The benefits and promise of language nerships. In K. A. Davis (Ed.), *Foreign language teaching and language minority education.* chnical Report #19, pp. 119–121). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language ching and Curriculum Center.

causality of language development, the data were analyzed for evidence of meaningful interaction, negotiation of meaning, and feedback, all of them beneficial aspects of interaction from the standpoint of theoretical perspectives on second language acquisition. There was meaningful interaction and some form of negotiation for meaning in nearly every session. This is rarely possible in university language classes, especially if they are conducted using a traditional grammar-translation approach.

The effects of the collaborative participation in the FLPP were quite dynamic and possibly long lasting (Syed, this volume). With the aid of their expert partners' modeling and feedback as well as reciprocal participation in the educational process, the participants expressed a new found understanding of concepts and issues. There were considerable attitudinal changes (with respect to self, others, language, and education) and an increase in linguistic competence and functionality. Through utilizing the particular competencies of the participants and valuing the cultural and linguistic identity these individuals bring with them, this project takes an important next step in the collaborative enterprise. The process of an emerging self-concept and how this has impacted the participants' academic performance serve to underscore the need for continued effort in this respect. Educators need to become better aware of the wealth of information and expertise available in our midst and begin to utilize these resources to their full potential.

Another important lesson learned in this endeavor is the importance of building coalitions (Hord, 1985; Lo Bianco, 1990). While there was not the quality and frequency of collaboration between university and high school teachers that was initially sought[1], their willingness to be part of this process was conducive to making it work. Given that this was a small scale initiative, it did not involve a large number of participants. Nevertheless, it did produce data which serves to inform both universities and high schools of the possibilities and mutual benefits in such efforts. The current political shift towards conservative policies, the debate on diversity, and educational cutbacks make it expedient for those involved in multicultural education, bilingual education, ESL, foreign language/studies, and education, along with minority populations to draw on common threads and establish coalitions in order to stem this growing tide of obstinate thought. It is in our mutual interests to join forces and present models of collaboration that not only enhance the educational experience for students, but also inform institutional change. By breaking down long standing walls that separate language departments in higher education, separate bilingual and 'mainstream' education at the high school level, and separate language and content in the classroom, we can begin the necessary dialogue that will inform and empower our practice.

[1] It was hoped that the teachers would incorporate these participants in their classroom practice. The high school partners could have served as native voices for classroom activities, while the university partners could have been academic liaisons for the high school classroom. Scheduling conflicts, limited resources, and consequently a limited number of participants in the project made this highly problematic.

Finally, the personal growth and attitudinal shifts documented by the FLPP point to the importance not only of collaboration in academic success, but also of developing an understanding and sensitivity towards others. The participants were able to enter into the world of their partners and see what it meant to make cultural choices and adjustments, learn English or a foreign language, maintain heritage language and culture, and generally view things from a different perspective. This is important since there is an increasing number of language minority students at all levels of education. They bring with them sociocultural backgrounds which are quite different from that of mainstream culture. It is essential in a growing multicultural, diverse citizenry that individuals be able to develop an understanding of others and of themselves through others. This ability to share and appreciate different perspectives while contributing one's own voice is a necessary condition if individuals and groups are to co-exist in a peaceful and supportive environment.

The importance collaborative efforts hold in learning and in initiating educational change is grounded in a tradition that views learning as occurring at both intra-and inter-personal levels. The FLPP model has served to produce interesting and informative data on a collaborative effort in language education. It argues that university-school partnerships should utilize the linguistic expertise of an increasingly diverse student population through forming a shared framework on language learning policy and planning. It further asserts that validating the linguistic and cultural identity of individuals through this kind of exercise can serve to bridge the gap between school and university and is thereby mutually beneficial. Working and learning with others is seemingly an unavoidable fact of life. From an early age, children are sharing resources, observing models, receiving feedback, and negotiating meaning in mediated tasks. Often, these early lessons are lost in the increasingly competitive aspects of education. The strength of the FLPP resides in the uniqueness of capitalizing on the neglected language resources of minority students while promoting interaction and collaboration between educational settings that remain otherwise isolated from each other (Ortega, this volume, Syed, this volume).

REFERENCES

Garcia, O. (1992). Societal multilingualism in a multicultural world in transition. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Languages for a multicultural world in transition. Northeast Conference Report* 1992 (pp. 1–27). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Hord, S. M. (1985). *Collaboration of cooperation: Comparisons and contrasts, dilemmas and decisions.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 258 356).

Huebner, T., Bartolome, L., Avelar-Lasalle, R., & Azevedo, M. (1989). Integrating language education, teacher training, and university-school collaboration: A pilot project. *Modern Language Journal, 73,* 23–31.

Lo Bianco, J. (1990). Making language policy: Australia's experience. In R. Baldauf & A. Luke, (Eds.), *Language planning and education in Australia and the South Pacific* (pp. 47–79). Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS AND HOW TO CONTACT THEM

EDITOR

Kathryn A. Davis is a faculty member in the ESL Department, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, where she specializes in qualitative research methods and language policy and planning. Her publications reflect these areas of specialization, including the macro- and microdimensions of language policy and planning, such as bilingual/foreign language education, indigenous language maintenance/revival, literacy, multiculturalism, and minority issues.
e-mail: kathrynd@hawaii.edu

AUTHORS

Audrey C. Burnett completed her undergraduate education at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. She earned a Professional Diploma in Secondary ESL and an MA in ESL from the University of Hawai'i in 1996. She was co-coordinator for the Foreign Language Partnership Project from 1995–1996.
e-mail: aburnett@hawaii.edu

Rebeca Jasso-Aguilar is the coordinator of Foreign Language Education and instructor of Spanish at San Juan College in Farmington, New Mexico. She obtained her MA in ESL at the University of Hawai'i in the winter of 1996. She has published an article on second language socialization in the University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL, and an article on needs analysis for language teaching in the Journal of English for Specific Purposes. Since beginning her work with San Juan College in the fall of 1997 she has done no research but has dedicated most of her time to supporting the struggle of the Zapatistas in Chiapas, Mexico.
e-mail: jasso_r@sjc.cc.nm.us

Lourdes Ortega is a PhD candidate in Second Language Acquisition at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, where she also teaches Spanish composition for the European Languages Department and ESL and TESOL courses for the Department of English as a Second Language. Her research interests include Spanish interlanguage development, the effect of instruction in adult SLA, and language teacher education.
e-mail: ortega@hawaii.edu

Ann Shonle received her MA in English as a Second Language from the University of Hawai'i in 1996. Her thesis on Hmong literacy in an immigrant community won the Harry Witten Prize for Scholarly Excellence. She served on the Centerwide Education Council of the East-West Center and as Vice President of the Hawai'i Association for Teachers of ESL while at UH. Since then, Ann has directed her attention to public schools and second language education, particularly for immigrant students. She taught eighth grade for two years, and is currently helping to start a Newcomer Pathways program for recently arrived

high school age students in the Boulder Valley District in Colorado, where she will teach intensive beginning ESL and Spanish literacy.
e-mail: ashonle@henge.com

Zafar Syed received his MA in ESL from the University of Hawai'i. He has worked in a number of programs in Japan, Canada, and Hawai'i both as a teacher and teacher educator. Presently he is an instructor at the Military Language Institute, United Arab Emirates, and a visiting instructor at the University of British Columbia, Canada. His research interests include identity and language education, cross-cultural adaptation, and pedagogy.
e-mail: zafar37@emirates.net.ae

Megan Thompson Rolland is the assistant director of admission at Viewpoint School in Calabasas, California, an independent, coeducational college preparatory school for kindergarten through Grade 12. She received her BA in English in 1992 and her MA in English as a Second Language in 1995 from the University of Hawai'i. Her professional interest in educational administration and student services began when she served as the project coordinator the Foreign Language Partnership pilot project in 1994–95. While working as an academic advisor at Salt Lake Community College she served as chair of the Advising Quarters to Semester Conversion Committee and now coordinates the Minority Admission Program at Viewpoint School. Interests include assisting minority and at-risk students in gaining access to academic programs, information, and resources needed to access higher education opportunities.
e-mail: prolland@atmos.ucla.edu

SLTCC
TECHNICAL REPORTS

The Technical Reports of the Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center at the University of Hawai'i (SLTCC) report on ongoing curriculum projects, provide the results of research related to second language learning and teaching, and also include extensive related bibliographies. SLTCC Technical Reports are available through University of Hawai'i Press.

RESEARCH METHODS IN INTERLANGUAGE PRAGMATICS

GABRIELE KASPER
MERETE DAHL

This technical report reviews the methods of data collection employed in 39 studies of interlanguage pragmatics, defined narrowly as the investigation of nonnative speakers' comprehension and production of speech acts, and the acquisition of L2-related speech act knowledge. Data collection instruments are distinguished according to the degree to which they constrain informants' responses, and whether they tap speech act perception/comprehension or production. A main focus of discussion is the validity of different types of data, in particular their adequacy to approximate authentic performance of linguistic action. 51 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #1) ISBN 0–8248–1419–3 $10.

A FRAMEWORK FOR TESTING CROSS-CULTURAL PRAGMATICS

THOM HUDSON
EMILY DETMER
J. D. BROWN

This technical report presents a framework for developing methods that assess cross-cultural pragmatic ability. Although the framework has been designed for Japanese and American cross-cultural contrasts, it can serve as a generic approach that can be applied to other language contrasts. The focus is on the variables of social distance, relative power, and the degree of imposition within the speech acts of requests, refusals, and apologies. Evaluation of performance is based on recognition of the speech act, amount of speech, forms or formulæ used, directness, formality, and politeness. 51 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #2) ISBN 0–8248–1463–0 $10.

PRAGMATICS OF JAPANESE AS NATIVE AND TARGET LANGUAGE

GABRIELE KASPER *(Editor)*

This technical report includes three contributions to the study of the pragmatics of Japanese:

- A bibliography on speech act performance, discourse management, and other pragmatic and sociolinguistic features of Japanese;
- A study on introspective methods in examining Japanese learners' performance of refusals; and
- A longitudinal investigation of the acquisition of the particle *ne* by nonnative speakers of Japanese.

125 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #3) ISBN 0–8248–1462–2 $10.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PEDAGOGY & RESEARCH IN INTERPRETATION & TRANSLATION

ETILVIA ARJONA

This technical report includes four types of bibliographic information on translation and interpretation studies:

- Research efforts across disciplinary boundaries—cognitive psychology, neurolinguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, computational linguistics, measurement, aptitude testing, language policy, decision-making, theses, dissertations;
- Training information covering—program design, curriculum studies, instruction, school administration;
- Instruction information detailing—course syllabi, methodology, models, available textbooks; and
- Testing information about aptitude, selection, diagnostic tests.

115 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #4) ISBN 0–8248–1572–6 $10.

PRAGMATICS OF CHINESE AS NATIVE AND TARGET LANGUAGE

GABRIELE KASPER *(Editor)*

This technical report includes six contributions to the study of the pragmatics of Mandarin Chinese:

- A report of an interview study conducted with nonnative speakers of Chinese; and
- Five data-based studies on the performance of different speech acts by native speakers of Mandarin—requesting, refusing, complaining, giving bad news, disagreeing, and complimenting.

312 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #5) ISBN 0–8248–1733–8 $15.

THE ROLE OF PHONOLOGICAL CODING IN READING *KANJI*

SACHIKO MATSUNAGA

In this technical report the author reports the results of a study that she conducted on phonological coding in reading *kanji* using an eye-movement monitor and draws some pedagogical implications. In addition, she reviews current literature on the different schools of thought regarding instruction in reading *kanji* and its role in the teaching of non-alphabetic written languages like Japanese. 64 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #6) ISBN 0–8248–1734–6 $10.

DEVELOPING PROTOTYPIC MEASURES OF CROSS-CULTURAL PRAGMATICS

THOM HUDSON
EMILY DETMER
J. D. BROWN

Although the study of cross-cultural pragmatics has gained importance in applied linguistics, there are no standard forms of assessment that might make research comparable across studies and languages. The present volume describes the process through which six forms of cross-cultural assessment were developed for second language learners of English. The models may be used for second language learners of other languages. The six forms of assessment involve two forms each of indirect discourse completion tests, oral language production, and self assessment. The procedures involve the assessment of requests, apologies, and refusals. 198 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #7) ISBN 0–8248–1763–X $15.

VIRTUAL CONNECTIONS: ONLINE ACTIVITIES & PROJECTS FOR NETWORKING LANGUAGE LEARNERS

MARK WARSCHAUER
(Editor)

Computer networking has created dramatic new possibilities for connecting language learners in a single classroom or across the globe. This collection of activities and projects makes use of e-mail, the World Wide Web, computer conferencing, and other forms of computer-mediated communication for the foreign and second language classroom at any level of instruction. Teachers from around the world submitted the activities compiled in this volume — activities that they have used successfully in their own classrooms. 417 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #8) ISBN 0–8248–1793–1 $30.

ATTENTION & AWARENESS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING

RICHARD SCHMIDT
(Editor)

Issues related to the role of attention and awareness in learning lie at the heart of many theoretical and practical controversies in the foreign language field. This collection of papers presents research into the learning of Spanish, Japanese, Finnish, Hawaiian, and English as a second language (with additional comments and examples from French, German, and miniature artificial languages) that bear on these crucial questions for foreign language pedagogy. 394 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #9) ISBN 0–8248–1794–X $20.

LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGE TEACHING: PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIXTH JOINT LSH-HATESL CONFERENCE

C. REVES, C. STEELE, C. S. P. WONG *(Editors)*

Technical Report #10 contains 18 articles revolving around the following three topics:

- Linguistic issues—These six papers discuss various linguistics issues: ideophones, syllabic nasals, linguistic areas, computation, tonal melody classification, and *wh*-words.
- Sociolinguistics—Sociolinguistic phenomena in Swahili, signing, Hawaiian, and Japanese are discussed in four of the papers.
- Language teaching and learning—These eight papers cover prosodic modification, note taking, planning in oral production, oral testing, language policy, L2 essay organization, access to dative alternation rules, and child noun phrase structure development. 364 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #10) ISBN 0–8248–1851–2 $20.

LANGUAGE LEARNING MOTIVATION: PATHWAYS TO THE NEW CENTURY

REBECCA L. OXFORD *(Editor)*

This volume chronicles a revolution in our thinking about what makes students want to learn languages and what causes them to persist in that difficult and rewarding adventure. Topics in this book include the internal structures of and external connections with foreign language motivation; exploring adult language learning motivation, self-efficacy, and anxiety; comparing the motivations and learning strategies of students of Japanese and Spanish; and enhancing the theory of language learning motivation from many psychological and social perspectives. 218 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #11) ISBN 0–8248–1849–0 $20.

TELECOLLABORATION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING: PROCEEDINGS OF THE HAWAI'I SYMPOSIUM

MARK WARSCHAUER *(Editor)*

The Symposium on Local & Global Electronic Networking in Foreign Language Learning & Research, part of the National Foreign Language Resource Center's *1995 Summer Institute on Technology & the Human Factor in Foreign Language Education*, included presentations of papers and hands-on workshops conducted by Symposium participants to facilitate the sharing of resources, ideas, and information about all aspects of electronic networking for foreign language teaching and research, including electronic discussion and conferencing, international cultural exchanges, real-time communication and simulations, research and resource retrieval via the Internet, and research using networks. This collection presents a sampling of those presentations. 252 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #12) ISBN 0–8248–1867–9 $20.

LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES AROUND THE WORLD: CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVES

REBECCA L. OXFORD *(Editor)*

Language learning strategies are the specific steps students take to improve their progress in learning a second or foreign language. Optimizing learning strategies improves language performance. This ground-breaking book presents new information about cultural influences on the use of language learning strategies. It also shows innovative ways to assess students' strategy use and remarkable techniques for helping students improve their choice of strategies, with the goal of peak language learning. 166 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #13) ISBN 0–8248–1910–1 $20.

SIX MEASURES OF JSL PRAGMATICS

SAYOKO OKADA YAMASHITA

This book investigates differences among tests that can be used to measure the cross-cultural pragmatic ability of English-speaking learners of Japanese. Building on the work of Hudson, Detmer, and Brown (Technical Reports #2 and #7 in this series), the author modified six test types which she used to gather data from North American learners of Japanese. She found numerous problems with the multiple-choice discourse completion test but reported that the other five tests all proved highly reliable and reasonably valid. Practical issues involved in creating and using such language tests are discussed from a variety of perspectives. 213 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #14) ISBN 0–8248–1914–4 $15.

NEW TRENDS & ISSUES IN TEACHING JAPANESE LANGUAGE & CULTURE

HARUKO M. COOK, KYOKO HIJIRIDA, & MILDRED TAHARA *(Editors)*

In recent years, Japanese has become the fourth most commonly taught foreign language at the college level in the United States. As the number of students who study Japanese has increased, the teaching of Japanese as a foreign language has been established as an important academic field of study. This technical report includes nine contributions to the advancement of this field, encompassing the following five important issues:

- Literature and literature teaching
- Technology in the language classroom
- Orthography
- Testing
- Grammatical versus pragmatic approaches to language teaching

164 pp.

(SLTCC Technical Report #15) ISBN 0–8248–2067–3 $20.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LEXICAL TONE PHONOLOGY IN AMERICAN ADULT LEARNERS OF STANDARD MANDARIN CHINESE

SYLVIA HENEL SUN

The study reported is based on an assessment of three decades of research on the SLA of Mandarin tone. It investigates whether differences in learners' tone perception and production are related to differences in the effects of certain linguistic, task, and learner factors. The learners of focus are American students of Mandarin in Beijing, China. Their performances on two perception and three production tasks are analyzed through a host of variables and methods of quantification.

(SLTCC Technical Report #16) ISBN 0–8248–2068–1 $20.

SECOND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN WRITING: MEASURES OF FLUENCY, ACCURACY, AND COMPLEXITY

KATE WOLFE-QUINTERO, SHUNJI INAGAKI, & HAE-YOUNG KIM

In this book, the authors analyze and compare the ways that fluency, accuracy, grammatical complexity, and lexical complexity have been measured in studies of language development in second language writing. More than 100 developmental measures are examined, with detailed comparisons of the results across the studies that have used each measure. The authors discuss the theoretical foundations for each type of developmental measure, and they consider the relationship between developmental measures and various types of proficiency measures. They also examine criteria for determining which developmental measures are the most successful, and they suggest which measures are the most promising for continuing work on language development.

(SLTCC Technical Report #17) ISBN 0–8248–2069–X $20.

DESIGNING SECOND LANGUAGE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENTS

JOHN M. NORRIS, JAMES DEAN BROWN, THOM HUDSON, & JIM YOSHIOKA

This technical report focuses on the decision-making potential provided by second language performance assessments. The authors first situate performance assessment within a broader discussion of alternatives in language assessment and in educational assessment in general. They then discuss issues in performance assessment design, implementation, reliability, and validity. Finally, they present a prototype framework for second language performance assessment based on the integration of theoretical underpinnings and research findings from the task-based language teaching literature, the language testing literature, and the educational measurement literature. The authors outline test and item specifications, and they present numerous examples of prototypical language tasks. They also propose a research agenda focusing on the operationalization of second language performance assessments.

(SLTCC Technical Report #18) ISBN 0–8248–2109–2 $20.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING & MINORITY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

KATHRYN A. DAVIS
(Editor)

This volume seeks to examine the potential for building relationships among foreign language, bilingual, and ESL programs towards fostering bilingualism. Part I of the volume examines the sociopolitical contexts for language partnerships, including:

- obstacles to developing bilingualism
- implications of acculturation, identity, and language issues for linguistic minorities.
- the potential for developing partnerships across primary, secondary, and tertiary institutions

Part II of the volume provides research findings on the *Foreign language partnership project* designed to capitalize on the resources of immigrant students to enhance foreign language learning.

(SLTCC Technical Report #19) ISBN 0–8248–2067–3 $20.

TECHNICAL REPORT #19

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING & LANGUAGE MINORITY EDUCATION

This volume seeks to examine the potential for building relationships among foreign language, bilingual, and ESL programs with the goal of fostering bilingualism. Part I of the volume examines the sociopolitical contexts for language partnerships, including:

- current obstacles to developing bilingualism
- implications of acculturation, identity, and language issues for linguistic minorities
- the potential for developing partnerships across primary, secondary, and tertiary institutions

Part II of the volume provides research findings on the Foreign Language Partnership Project, which was designed to capitalize on the resources of immigrant students to enhance foreign language learning.

ributed by
versity of Hawai'i Press
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822

ISBN 0-8248-2239-0

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☐ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☒ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

EFF-089 (3/2000)